DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 511 PS 006 197

TITLE Family Day Care West: A Working Conference.
INSTITUTION Pacific Oaks Coll., Pasadena, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 72
NOTE 169p.; Conference of the Community Family Day Care Project of Pacific Oaks College (Pasadena, California, Feb. 18-19, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Certification; Community Programs; Comparative Analysis; *Conferences; Day Care Programs; *Day Care Services; Intervention; Mothers; Referral; Research; *Surveys; *Working Women; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

An attempt is made to condense data on family day care, i.e., a form of supplemental child care that takes place in the home of a nonrelative. An overview is presented of the kinds of studies that have been done and how they fit into the larger picture of what remains to be done before we can claim to have a body of knowledge to guide us in this area. The available research is classified into four general groups: (1) surveys of the extent of family day care among other types of child care arrangements of working mothers and surveys of the need for day care resources of different types, (2) research on the effects of maternal employment, separation and deprivation, and compensatory programs on family and child development, (3) field studies of the family day care arrangement as a social system, of consumer and caregiver attitudes, behaviors, and life circumstances; and observational studies of family day care as a child rearing environment; and (4) demonstrations of intervention programs and support systems for family day care, with special reference to the Day Care Neighbor Service (Portland), the Community Family Day Care Project (Pasadena), information and referral programs, licensing, and agency supervised family day care. (Author/CK)

ED 070511

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FAMILY DAY CARE WEST

A WORKING CONFERENCE

PS 006197

The Community Family Day Care Project of Pacific Oaks College
714 West California Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91105

INTRODUCTION

"Family Day Care West - A Working Conference" was a meeting that brought people together (representing a variety of view-points) to talk about family day care. Those of us working with the invisible network of family day care felt the need to compare concerns, mutual problems and ideas for solutions and future direction. Pacific Oaks College faculty members and students assumed the responsibility of the organization and implementation of the Conference; but the ideas, direction, papers and enthusiasm were generated from Washington, Oregon, Northern, Central and Southern California, as well as from the mid-West (Kansas) and the East (Washington, D.C.)

I remember my first meeting with Art Emlen, Betty Donoghue, Alice Collins and Eunice Watson in Portland in March, 1971. I believe that was where the idea of this Conference was born. We talked, read and exchanged information that was extremely helpful for the planning of the Community Family Day Care Project. Then in San Francisco, in November, 1971, I met Susanne Greer and Belle Lipsett and it became apparent that we had much to say to each other. Liz Prescott and I had begun to meet with Norrie Class about some of the licensing problems of family day care. The Conference started to evolve and take shape. Suzie Klemer offered to help coordinate all of the details of the meeting and we were on our way.

Our major problem was one of how to keep the Conference small, yet representative enough, so that it, indeed, could be a "working conference." In retrospect, we did make some mistakes ... I think we all agreed that there should have been more representation from the consumers of family day care, as well as other groups, next time. However, I, for one, was pleased with the quality and quantity of work we accomplished. Special thanks must go to Art Emlen, Betty Donoghue, Liz Prescott, Norrie Class and Gloria Sparks for the fine papers they developed for this Conference. These position papers were sent to the participants prior to the Conference and they are also incorporated in these proceedings.

We are sorry that it took so long to publish the proceedings, but the process was a tedious one. Each tape was transcribed by Marye Myers, who did a fantastic job (some of the meetings were rather enthusiastic and we didn't take turns speaking.) After identifying each speaker, Suzie Klemer, Yolanda Torres and I had the difficult task of making choices about which words of wisdom should be included or excluded. We hope that we were able to make the decisions that will convey the seriousness, combined with humor, which we found as we listened to the tapes. All of the discussions that are reported were not necessarily in sequence or total statements. We took the prerogative, and responsibility, of editors to try to arrange the discussions so that they would have the most meaning possible.

Each participant who joined Family Day Care West deserves special recognition -- you all shared your time and thinking (and some of you came at your own expense) on a Friday afternoon and evening, plus all day Saturday (and on a holiday weekend to boot) in order to better understand and help the cause of quality day care for children and their families. I was delighted that Pacific Oaks students were part of the group and especially grateful for the work which Ede Haselhoef contributed in order to make the process a smooth one. Special thanks go to Art Emlen and Liz Prescott for their counsel, relevant papers and excellent job of chairing the *meetings; to the Community Family Day Care Project staff (Maxine Davis, Cynthia Milich and Yolanda Torres) for filling in wherever necessary; to a long-time friend, Suzy Klemer, for making it all possible, delicious and pretty; to Mary B. Pepys for an excellent job of lay-out, typing and suggestions for editing; and to Bob LaCrosse for his support in permitting us to do our "thing."*

A few words about the meetings: It was interesting to note a few common threads that ran throughout the material of the Conference. One had to do with the need for many kinds of support for quality family day care - not just material kinds, but more abstract types such as those of image building and understanding of what family day care has to offer. Another had to do with the fact that although we were concentrating on family day care, we were not saying that this was the only kind of care possible or desirable for all; rather that there had to be meaningful choices in the kinds of care that were to be provided for children. Research issues were raised and discussed and there seemed to be general agreement that more action research was needed - especially of the type in which Prescott, Nye, Emlen, Heinicke and Milich are now involved. And of great importance, family day care mothers (Ms. Gomez, Greer, Horvath and Byrd) were the people who brought the issues to the practical, common-sense level, with marvelous anecdotes and real everyday questions and answers. Many important theoretical items were raised in this Conference, but the family day care mothers remind me, and I hope you, of the practical issue at hand --- where do we go from here?

June Sale, Director
Community Family Day Care Project

July, 1972

STAFF

Conference Coordinator - Suzy Klemer

Registrar - Ede Haselhoef

Community Family Day Care Project

Director - June Sale

Assistant Directors - Yolanda Torres
- Maxine Davis

Evaluation Coordinator - Cynthia Milich

Field Demonstration Assistants

Louise Dobbs
Audrey Freedman
Helen Howard
Helen Jacob
Cathy Mugasis
Charlene Nicholie
Jim Nicholie
Linnea Peterson
Ruth Robinson
Lupe Villegas

PARTICIPANTS

Ms. Paula Bernstein
National Organization for Women
403 Mar Vista
Pasadena, California 91106

Ms. Doris Byrd
Family Day Care Mother
Community Family Day Care Project
1050 North Summit
Pasadena, California 91103

Ms. Daniska Cager, D.P.S.S.
Program Director-Group Day Care Services
3858 West Santa Barbara
Los Angeles, California 90008

Norris Class, Ph.D.
Professor, School of Social Work
University of Southern California
147 South Madison Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90004

Ms. Betty Donoghue
Research Associate
Field Study of Neighborhood Day Care
2856 N.W. Savier
Portland, Oregon 97210

The Honorable Mervyn Dymally
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, California 95814

Arthur Emlen, Ph.D.
Field Study of Neighborhood Day Care
2856 N.W. Savier
Portland, Oregon 97210

Ms. Amparo Gomez
Family Day Care Mother
Community Family Day Care Project
1567 Mar Vista
Pasadena, California 91104

Ms. Susanne Greer
Licensed Day Care Operators Assoc., Inc.
1616 Belvedere
Berkeley, California 94707

Christoph M. Heinicke, Ph.D.
Director of Research
% Reiss-Davis Child Study Center
9760 West Pico Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90035

Ms. Susanne Horvath
Licensed Day Care Operators Assoc., Inc.
959 Ventura Avenue
Albany, California 94707

Ms. Patricia Krantz
% Center for Applied Behavioral Analysis
313AA Bristol Terrace
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Esther Kresh, Ph.D.
Office of Child Development
Post Office Box 1182
Washington, D.C. 20013

Ms. Sybil Kritchevsky
Research Associate
Pacific Oaks College
714 West California Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91105

Robert LaCrosse, Ph.D.
President, Pacific Oaks College
714 West California Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91105

Ms. Joyce Lazar
Social Research
George Washington University
2401 Virginia Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20037

Ms. Belle Lipsett
Day Care Developer
Contra Costa County Social Service
435 Valley View
El Sobrante, California 94803

Ms. Dolly Lynch
Office of Child Development
Post Office Box 1182
Washington, D.C. 20013

Ms. Audrey Dixon Mayes
Bureau of Maternal & Child Health
State Department of Health
Terminal Annex - P.O. Box 30327
Los Angeles, California 90030

Ms. Phyllis Nophlin
Office of Economic Opportunity
Human Resources Division
1200 - 19th Street N.W.-Room M721
Washington, D.C. 20506

F. Ivan Nye, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99163

Ann DeHuff Peters, M.D.
1010 Muirlands Vista Way
La Jolla, California 92037

Ms. Elizabeth Prescott
Director of Research
Pacific Oaks College
714 West California Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91105

Ms. Virginia Rigney
Alameda County Welfare Department
401 Broadway
Oakland, California 94607

Ms. Betty Smith
Community Family Day Care Project
728 North Los Robles
Pasadena, California 91104

Ms. Jan Taylor
Office of Economic Opportunity
Human Resources Division
1200 - 19th Street N.W.-Room M721
Washington, D.C. 20506

Ms. Enid Welling
Office of Child Development
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, California

Mr. Euell Winton
% Kaiser Foundation Medical
Care Program
1924 Broadway
Oakland, California 94604

FAMILY DAY CARE WEST - A WORKING CONFERENCE

Sponsored by:
The Community Family Day Care Project* of Pacific Oaks College
714 West California Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91105

Friday, February 18, 1972

12:00	Lunch - Welcome - E. Robert LaCrosse President, Pacific Oaks College
1:30 - 4:30	Session - Present Realities in Family Day Care Position Papers: "Family Day Care Research - A Summary and Critical Review" by Arthus Emlen "What Do Mothers and Caregivers Want in a Family Day Care Arrangement" by Betty Donoghue Chairman: Arthur Emlen
5:30	Social Hour and Dinner
7:30	Session - Present Realities in All Day Care Position Paper: "Group and Family Day Care - A Comparative Assessment" by Elizabeth Prescott Chairwoman: Elizabeth Prescott

Saturday, February 19, 1972

9:30 - 11:30	Session - The Future of Family Day Care Position Papers: "The Public Regulation of Family Day Care - An Innovative Proposal" by Norris E. Class "Problems and Alternatives Related to Provision of Family Day Care Services" by Gloria B. Sparks Chairwoman: June Sale
12:00	Lunch
1:30 - 4:30	Session - The Future of Family Day Care Discussion and Evaluation Chairwoman: Elizabeth Prescott

---

* Funded by Children's Bureau
Office of Child Development
HEW - Demonstration Project
OCD-CB-10 (C1)

SESSION I

FIELD STUDY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD FAMILY DAY CARE SYSTEM
2856 NORTHWEST SAVIER
PORTLAND, OREGON 97210
(503) 228-7263

FAMILY DAY CARE RESEARCH--A SUMMARY AND CRITICAL REVIEW

Prepared for
"Family Day Care West--A Working Conference"
to be held at
Pacific Oaks College
Pasadena, California
February 18-19, 1972

Arthur C. Emlen, Ph.D.
Project Director

A RESEARCH PROJECT OF THE TRI-COUNTY COMMUNITY COUNCIL IN COOPERATION WITH PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
SUPPORTED BY UNITED STATES CHILDREN'S BUREAU GRANT R-287

FAMILY DAY CARE RESEARCH--A SUMMARY AND CRITICAL REVIEW

In this paper my job is to summarize what we know about family day care--that is about a form of supplemental child care that takes place in the home of a nonrelative. Who uses it and why? What are the caregivers like in family day care? What kind of a social arrangement are we talking about and what makes it tick? What kind of a child rearing environment does it provide? What are its effects upon the child and his development?

Mostly we shall be talking about the characteristics of family day care as a natural social system, since the best estimates are that ninety-eight per cent of them in the United States are private, informal unlicensed arrangements, unsupervised by public or voluntary agencies (Ruderman, 1968; Emlen, 1970; Johns and Gould--Westinghouse-Westat, 1971). Therefore this paper should include what we know about intervention programs designed to influence family day care arrangements. What kind of policy and service interventions have been demonstrated? How feasible are they and how effective are they in influencing family day care and its outcomes?

I shall try to present an overview of the kinds of studies that have been done and how they fit into the larger picture of what remains to be done before we can claim to have a body of knowledge to guide us in this area. Please remember that in this paper it is not my job to review current practice in relation to family day care but only the research that has been done about it. This includes, of course, demonstration projects if they were systematically investigated and something was learned from them. This paper ignores the considerable research in day care, child development and compensatory education that is not specifically concerned with family day care.

The gap that this paper attempts to fill is the huge hiatus in public and professional knowledge of the elementary facts and realities of family day care. This nation has been only too willing to legislate, plan and develop day care programs based on false assumptions about family day care. Those of us who labor in the vineyards of family day care research have not done enough to draw attention to the importance of what we have been doing. In the past two years there has been a rash of reviews of day care research, most of which all but ignore the family day care literature and reveal a groundless bias in favor of day care and child development programs that take place within the context of a day care center. Family day care research attracts as little attention as its subject matter, and it is our hope that this conference will bring out into the open the strengths and limitations of family day care as a national resource for children and their families. Were I to limit myself to what we know for sure, this paper would now be over. However, demand for action and the need for policy are upon us, and I shall try to draw some reasonable conclusions from the evidence at hand.

What Kinds of Research Have Been Done

As a quick overview I think it would be useful to classify the available research into four general groups.

(1) Surveys of the extent of family day care among other types of child care arrangements of working mothers and surveys of the need for day care resources of different types.

(2) Research on the effects of maternal employment, separation and deprivation, and compensatory programs on family and child development.

(3) Field studies of the family day care arrangement as a social system, of consumer and caregiver attitudes, behaviors, and life circumstances; and observational studies of family day care as a child rearing environment.

(4) Demonstrations of intervention programs and support systems for family day care, with special reference to the Day Care Neighbor Service (Portland), the Community Family Day Care Project (Pasadena), information and referral programs, licensing, and agency supervised family day care.

Surveys of Day Care Needs

The surveys of day care needs characteristically have been conceptually weak and have substituted bias for evidence. These need surveys have ranged in quality from "bias in, bias out" non-surveys such as conducted by Keyserling (1971) to area probability surveys such as Ruderman's (1968). Though the inferences about "need" for day care range from fallacious to crude, many of these surveys have contributed to our knowledge of the extent of family day care and the characteristics of this target population: surveys by the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau (Lajewski, 1948; Low and Spindler, 1968), the Ruderman Study (1968), the Westinghouse-Westat Study (Johns and Gould, 1971), the ABT Survey (1971), as well as numerous local surveys. It should be said, too, that survey research as a method permits more powerful kinds of analytical techniques than have been used in any of the day care surveys.

Almost the first thing that comes to mind when a community decides to do something about day care is "Let's do a survey." This response is perhaps best understandable when it is recalled that animals faced with a new situation scurry around before focusing on some goal-directed piece of behavior. It seems to serve some need for orientation. For many decades communities all over the country and some national surveys have been scurrying about in the name of research without making any substantial contribution to knowledge because they fail to ask useful questions. I have vented my spleen on the subject of need surveys on two previous occasions (1970, 1971) and I will try not to repeat myself now. What is relevant to this paper is that these need studies consist of the following elements.

a. Extent of informal, unlicensed child care

Need for day care is defined as need for licensed, organized day care facilities and therefore the entire population of family day care children of working mothers are counted as a part of the need. The persistent simpleminded assumption seems to be that all you have to do is to figure out how many day care centers you need to build by counting all the people who aren't in them but "should be."

In general day care surveys have failed to come up with meaningful assessments of the needs for day care facilities largely because the wrong questions have been asked or else no questions have been asked at all. There even have been technically competent large-scale surveys based on area probability sampling that fell short of their aims for lack of a clear conceptual definition of the problem of day care needs.

These surveys have made some positive contributions. They have provided us with an overview of the extent to which different kinds of child care arrangements are used. The special census conducted in February 1965 (Low and Spindler, 1968), the Ruderman Study (1968), and the Westinghouse-

Westat Study (1971), as well as numerous smaller surveys, have provided us with useful data on the demographic characteristics and consumer attitudes of working mothers, as well as on the arrangements they have made and the strains and problems involved.

The evidence is that family day care is the largest out-of-home supplemental child care resource used for the purchase of day care in the United States today. Most of the children of working mothers are of school age, but most of the children in family day care are under six (Low and Spindler, 1968; Emlen and Watson, 1970, pp. 56-57). Among the under six children of full-time working mothers twice as many are in family day care as in any form of organized group care. Furthermore the use of nonrelatives now competes with the use of relatives (other than the father) as resources for supplemental child care whether in the home or outside the home (Low and Spindler, 1968; Emlen, Donoghue and LaForge, 1971, page 8). The conclusion is inescapable that private family day care has become a major social institution in the United States. Later I shall suggest some evidence from the Field Study in Portland as to why this should be so.

PS 006197

b. Projections of potential new populations of day care users

I have criticized elsewhere (1971) predictions of potential future demand which is supposed to materialize when additional mothers enter the labor force or seek day care for other reasons. Although the absolute numbers may increase, there is no convincing evidence for thinking that new populations will change the proportions of which formal types of day care are used. Also the "baby bust" should be kept in mind, which decreases the base rates. See Grier (1971) for a brilliant analysis of the 1970 census data showing three million fewer children under five than there were in 1960.

Further research needs to be given to the comparison of full-time and part-time working mothers, of working and nonworking mothers, to students and work-trainees, to welfare and nonwelfare mothers, to "housebound" mothers who want relief from child care for short periods of time and to mothers who work at home as opposed to out of the home. All of these represent different populations of actual or potential family day care users. Most of what we know about family day care, concerns the use of it by regular full-time or part-time working mothers, though we know from the Day Care Neighbor Service that it is widely used for many temporary and diverse purposes (Emlen and Watson, 1970, pp. 53-56).

c. Preferences

Preference data is used to show that family day care consumers would prefer a different type of care than they have. I am not satisfied with any of the preference data from the surveys to date but if forced to generalize from them I would have to say that roughly two-thirds of family day care users prefer it to other forms of care except home care (i.e., their own home). This does not really mean much, however. Preference research is still at a very rudimentary stage. One study (Willner, 1969) found private family day care users in New York City preferring center care but the sampling was done from center waiting lists, thus from the ranks of dissatisfied family day care users. A recent national survey conducted by Westinghouse-Westat (Johns and Gould, 1971) while based on an area probability sample of families with incomes under $8,000.00 · and children nine years and under, obtained a preference for center care among working mothers generally by posing the biased question, "If you wanted to improve the day care arrangement for your preschool child what kind of day care would you like best?"

Then they dropped from the analysis one-third of the respondents who in their perplexity or acquiescence gave a "don't know" answer.

Both the Ruderman Study (1968) and the Westinghouse-Westat Study (1971) have found sharp differences between blacks and whites in their preferences for family day care; blacks appear to use it more but prefer it less. Willner's results in New York City based on a sample consisting largely of blacks and Puerto Ricans is roughly consistent with this difference in preference data for white and blacks, as are the preference data from our own study in Portland, Oregon, of white working mothers using private family day care who prefer the type of arrangement that they have. On the other hand, Pittman (1970) in Philadelphia reports welfare recipients resisting referral to day care centers and preferring informal family day care arrangements. It seems likely that the difference is attributable to the socio-economic conditions of the two groups, especially the housing and neighborhood conditions and perhaps to the greater involvement of blacks in social agency programs.

Research on preferences needs to take into account how informed consumers are about the alternatives, as well as the feasibility or availability of alternative forms of care so as not to confound what is possible with what is preferred. We have done this on the panel study data we are currently analysing. In interpreting preferences it is also important to sort out response tendencies either to see the grass as greener in other pastures or to report preferring the choice one has made, in addition to other possible biasing responses. One would need to compare preference data from users from each type of supplemental child care arrangement as well as from potential day care consumers who are not yet using care. A related line of needed research is the prediction of actual day care use not only from preferences but from other determinants that account for the wide discrepancy between what people obligingly say or even plan to do and what they can manage to carry out when the time comes.

d. Waiting lists versus underenrollment

A third kind of evidence that is used as an indicator of need or a lack of need is the size of waiting lists on the one hand or underenrollment on the other hand. Such measures are crude, however, and are more a reflection of distribution problems and the efficient use of given resources than they are a measure of need for new resources. If there existed enough conveniently located day care centers to saturate the demand, underenrollment probably would be endemic. These same problems of distribution arise in family day care as well as in group care, although in family day care nobody is too concerned about the inefficiency and overhead expenses entailed by underenrollment. The evidence from our studies in Portland is pretty clear that underenrollment of existing and potential family day care resources is abundant while at the same time the family day care analog of the "waiting list" exists also (Emlen, 1971). Information and referral problems for the day care consumer cause delay and difficulty in making new arrangements and lead the consumer to think that there is a lack of available resources (Emlen, 1971).

e. Quality of care

A fourth aspect of need concerns judgements regarding the quality of care provided in available resources. On the basis of extreme examples and sheer bias, it is widely assumed that family day care arrangements are lacking in the qualities that would enhance the development of children. For criticism of such assumptions, see Emlen (1970; 1971). One of the main results of this paper and this conference should be to dispel such stereotypes of family day care and to concentrate on the evidence and research issues involved.

The frequency of occurrence of this bias in the literature appears to be directly related to the inability to cite evidence. I find the problem disconcerting, and since it is one this conference must face, let me quote a few examples of the problem we are up against:

> "Experts agree, however, that all the existing daytime services for children meet no more than 10% to 15% of the need. Some of the facts that lend credence to this dismal estimate include. . . Neglect--The nation's working mothers alone have 11 million children under twelve years of age. But there are fewer than ½ million places in licensed day care centers across the country."
>
> Fact Sheet, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.

> "The figures on child care need, then, are based on the per cent of children who are cared for by nonrelatives, whether in their own home, in the home of someone else, or in a group setting."
>
> Day Care of Children in Chicago: Needs and Resources, by Community Areas Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, 1967, p. 19.

> "Care in Outside Homes
>
> Almost a third of the preschool children within the scope of the federal study were cared for in homes other than their own. Some council women, seeing such home care at its best, considered it better than some of the center care observed. But they and many others have reported that the overwhelming majority of children in day care homes receive custodial care only. Some of the day care homes were described as unbelievably bad. For example: In a day care home licensed to care for no more than six children, there were 47 children attended by the day care mother without any assistance. Eight infants were tied to cribs; toddlers were tied to chairs; and 3-,4-, and 5-year-olds coped as best they could."
>
> Mary Dublin Keyserling, "Day Care Challenge: The Unmet Needs of Mothers and Children," Child Welfare, 50 (October 1971), 435f.

f. Cost analyses

Another species of survey is the cost-benefit and demand projections such as carried out by ABT Associates (Rowe, 1971) and Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Westat (Johns and Gould, 1971). Mary Rowe's report "The Economics of Child Care" provides a nice summary of the difficulties involved in this kind of effort. Rowe points out that the ABT Survey shows that "good" or "developmental" care costs more than the consumers can pay, but the studies all have organized rather than informal child care in mind. I think these kinds of studies are seriously limited in their value by their lack of understanding of the behavior of day care consumers and of the types of child care arrangement for which demand is manifested. It seems to me premature to cost out services the demand for which and the feasibility of which have not been demonstrated. The assumption that the day care consumer can be recruited or manipulated to depart from his usual pattern of utilization of resources is not warranted. Although I regard it as an undesirable policy, in principle it is a researchable question to ask whether or not day care consumers on a broad scale could be recruited to use day care centers. There is no reason why cost-benefit studies could not extend their horizons to encompass the social benefits and cost to the child, the family, and to society of such a course of action, but as a matter of policy, it would be wiser to pursue research regarding the choice behaviors of day care consumers and to accept freedom of choice as a basic tenet of our day care planning.

Let me summarize these comments on the need studies by urging that further research along this line start less from a priori points of departure and develop the field of consumer demand for types of day care services as a fruitful field of empirical research in which the accumulation of knowledge will provide us with better guidelines for action than the conceptually naive inferences that have been made from the surveys we have had to date. I do not mean to imply that many of these studies have not provided useful information. Many of these surveys are invaluable for providing perspective on the distributions found nationally for many of the variables needed for more detailed studies.

Research on the Effects of Maternal Employment, Separation and Deprivation, and Compensatory Programs on Family and Child Development

Let us move now from what is probably the least important area of research to the most important ultimately, from the area in which the worst research has been done to the area in which the best research tends to be done, and from the area where the most studies have been done to where the least work has been done that specifically relates to family day care. Research on the effects of maternal employment on the child and on the family is part of the main stream of behavioral science, cutting across family sociology, child development, and ethological approaches to the study of human behavior. It is to this literature that we should look for an assessment of what difference it makes to children and their families when a supplemental child care arrangement becomes a part of the total child rearing experience, and within that context we should be able to look to the compensatory education and child welfare services literature to assess the effects of interventions on the outcomes of such experiences. Unfortunately, however, this research literature, has failed, with one exception, to take into account the type of child care arrangement to which the child is exposed. Since this paper deals with family day care research, I must point out that the differential effects of family day care on the child in comparison with other forms of day care have not been investigated to the best of my knowledge. One study which I shall describe presently compared the effects of maternal employment (coupled with family day care) with the child's staying at home with his mother.

The research on the effects of maternal employment has been reviewed in a number of places (Herzog, 1960; Stolz, 1961; Nye and Hoffman, 1963; Caldwell, 1964). The gist of most of this work culminating in the early 1960s suggests that maternal employment per se is not associated with adverse effects on the child and that a number of child, family, and parenting variables need to be taken into account. But if the early work on maternal employment tended to ignore or take for granted the form and quality of the child care experience, the shift of research interest in the second half of the sixties tended to ignore antecedent and mediating family variables in its enthusiasm for the compensatory powers of supplemental experiences almost all of which were to take place within the context of day care centers and Head Start Programs with a heavy emphasis on education, curricula, training, and perplexity about what to do about the parents. Again family day care tended to be ignored as a setting within which to investigate compensatory programs (Grotberg, 1969). Exceptions include the work of Ira Gordon (   ) and Susan Gray (1970) which are among the interventions to be discussed later.

One study does not a body of knowledge make, but there was one maternal employment study that did involve family day care. It is a study that is frequently overlooked perhaps because it belies some of the negative impressions professionals and day care planners prefer to have about family day care. It is a study conducted under the direction of Professor Nye whom we are privileged to have participating in this conference. The study was conducted in Spokane, Washington, over ten years ago. It was a study of the social-psychological correlates of the employment of mothers, funded by NIMH. (It is perhaps not accidental that the title of this working conference should be "Family Day Care West," since there appear to be important regional differences in the attitudes of Western researchers toward family day care. One of the issues we might discuss is whether or not there are elements in the Western environment that are favorable for the development of this form of care.)

The aim of Nye's study was to test the maternal deprivation hypothesis for maternal employment. Is employment of mothers of preschoolers accompanied by personality damage to these children? Working and nonworking mothers were compared on three dependent variables: antisocial behavior, withdrawing behavior, and nervous symptoms, each measured by seven item Guttman quasi scales based on responses to standardized items. The design involved a cross-sectional survey in which a sample of 104 Spokane, Washington, full-time working mothers with children of ages three to five was obtained by area probability sampling. An ecologically matched control group was obtained by taking the nearest nonworking neighbor mothers of children three to five, also for a sample of 104. In addition, the "mother substitutes" (N=82) were interviewed. Most of these day care arrangements were made through informal contacts some of them involving either home care or care out of the home, i.e., family day care. The findings showed that for all three measures of effects on the child no significant differences were found between the children of working and nonworking mothers. The investigators controlled for two possible intervening variables: acceptance of and satisfaction with the child and compensating behavior by the working mother; still no significant differences were revealed.

Thus, yet another study failed to point to maternal employment with supplemental mothering as a source of maternal deprivation. The results of this study are consistent with other maternal employment studies that suggest that the maternal employment status per se as a gross condition is not a sufficiently potent variable to account for effects on the child's adjustment. Effects begin to appear, however, when other variables are taken into account, e.g., age and sex( ), attitudes toward employment status (Hoffman,), quality of supervision of child (Maccoby,). Research on the effects of maternal deprivation and separation involved more radical departures from ordinary child rearing experience, such as separation for longer periods than one day, institutional deprivation, or severe emotional neglect (Ainsworth, 1962; Heinicke and Westheimer, 1965; Yarrow, 1964; Mech, 1965).

With respect to the issue at hand in this paper it is worth noting that within the context of this kind of research differences in the type of child care arrangement have not been taken into account. The problem is exceedingly complex. It is likely that there are more critical differences existing within types of child care arrangements than between types of child care arrangements. Probably more important is to look at the critical dimensions of the child rearing experience and the relationships involved. We need more detailed studies of how the separation experience is managed in family day care as well as in other forms of day care. We need further study of the attachment processes that occur between infant and mother, infant and other maternal figures, as well as attachment that occurs with a series of surrogates (see for example, the work of Ainsworth, 1969). One of the problems that needs to be kept in mind is that among the determinates of differences between single and multiple mothering antecedent differences between the two populations of natural mothers may be as important as the relationship with the caregiver in the supplemental care situation (Caldwell, et. al., 1963). There is always the risk in day care and compensatory education research to attribute effects to the program inputs when they may actually be attributable to differences between populations who use one program rather than another.

Studies of Family Day Care as a Social System and as a Child Rearing Environment

In our own research in Portland we shied away from any effort to assess the effects on the child as an immediate goal of our research in order to investigate in a detailed way what family day care arrangements are like and how they work, as well as how they may be reached and influenced in a favorable way. So let me now describe some of the field studies and observational studies that have been done of family day care arrangements. They provide us with a better perspective as to what some of the critical dimensions of this form of care may be that will need to be taken into account either in studying the effects on the child or in designing intervention programs that will be feasible because they bear in mind the behavior patterns of day care consumers and caregivers. As we shall see there are some gross features of family day care as a child rearing experience that need to be taken into account because the differences between what is typical and what is deviant, e.g., in the number of children in care, should be of overriding significance in their effects on the children.

Most of what we know about private family day care arrangements in a detailed way has come from four places: Spokane, New York City, Portland, Oregon, and Pasadena. As part of the Nye study referred to above, Perry (1961; 1963) conducted a special exploratory inquiry regarding the caregivers or "mother substitutes" used by employed mothers in Spokane. Then Willner in New York City studied unsupervised family day care arrangements concentrating on evaluative issues concerning the warmth and quality of supervision and the adequacy of physical environment in which this form of care is given (1964, 1965, 1968, 1969, 1970). Willner's study began as a survey of the "scope and magnitude" but changed its focus when area probability sampling efforts proved unsuccessful (Vernon and Willner, 1964).

In Portland we have conducted a series of studies over the past several years. First there were some exploratory studies conducted in connection with a demonstration project called the Day Care Exchange Project (Children's Bureau Demonstration Grant #D135). These were followed by the Field Study of the Neighborhood Family Day Care System starting in March, 1967. The Field Study also has included a demonstration called the Day Care Neighbor Service, but I shall postpone discussing it until we take up the topic of demonstrations of intervention programs.

In the Field Study we have concentrated our attention on the characteristics of family day care as a natural system as it occurs in the neighborhood. We have looked at the social interaction between working mother and caregiver in the formation, maintenance, and termination of the family day care arrangement. We have looked at the selection process and asked why they picked one another, how they go about it, not only what they report looking for in one another, but how satisfied they are with what they find and in fact in what ways do they actually match up.

Ruderman (1968) compared levels of satisfaction found in different types of care and revealed some of the sources of strain to be found in family day care, and in the Field Study we went into the measurement of specific sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction that arise within the arrangement. We looked at the correlates of satisfaction in order to discover the conditions under which mothers and caregivers will make arrangements with which they will be satisfied (Emlen, Donoghue, and LaForge, 1971). Likewise, we have looked at those objective life circumstances, attitudes and modes of adaptation that appear to limit the freedom of choice of the users and givers of family day care and create the feeling of dependence on this arrangement as an only and constraining alternative. Our approach has been to explore the costs and benefits for both parties to the arrangement as a way to understanding and predicting what it takes to keep an arrangement going. We have asked the question, "To what extent does the stability of the family day care arrangement depend on the working mother and her circumstances, attitudes and behavior, to what extent on the caregiver, and to what extent on how they deal with one another." The answer to this question leads one toward quite different policy and program interventions.

A primary assumption in this approach is that the working mother and the caregiver of her choice are the principal actors in the incipient social system that they create when they make a family day care arrangement. The fate of the child depends upon them and their social interaction, and the child's adjustment becomes a factor only as it is perceived and evaluated by them. Likewise, intervention programs must take their attitudes and behaviors into account in order to be successful.

The Field Study findings I shall be drawing upon in the summary soon to follow come primarily from the study of the Day Care Neighbor Service involving 200 caregivers and 422 care users (Emlen and Watson, 1970), from a cross-sectional study of 104 family day care arrangements in which no program intervention was involved and in which both parties to the arrangement were interviewed during an ongoing arrangement (Emlen, Donoghue and LaForge, 1971); and from a longitudinal study involving 116 arrangements that were followed from the beginning through to termination of the arrangement again based on interviews with both parties (not yet reported).

Finally, the last study I am including in this group is the Pacific Oaks Study in Pasadena, California, called the Community Family Day Care Project. Though designed as a comprehensive set of demonstrations, this project now in its second year, is making an additional unique contribution to our knowledge of family day care primarily through a systematic observational approach to describing and analysing family day care as a child rearing environment. Just as the Field Study in Portland is based on a considerable investment in the development of methodology for the measurement of attitudes and in the study of family day care as a social system, the Community Family Day Care

Project draws on the even longer experience of Pacific Oaks researchers, Prescott, Jones, Kritchevsky, and Milich (see references) in developing a refined methodology for observation of child-rearing environments. Used with success in analysing group care experiences in day care centers, the research of Prescott and associates has provided us with the best understanding we have of the character of center life as it affects the immediate experiences of children. Cynthia Milich has described preliminary efforts to adapt this methodology to family day care as a child-rearing environment (Sale, 1971, pages 176-192) and Prescott in her paper at this conference will be reporting on some of their findings.

This observational research is of course made possible by the Community Family Day Care Project itself which in addition to its multi-faceted demonstration has also provided to date descriptive data regarding some twenty-two caregivers who are also involved in the project as consultants in the community efforts of the project.(Sale, 1971). The descriptive data reported by Sale regarding the arrangements made with these twenty-two caregivers (or "day care mothers" as they call them) are very similar to the characteristics reported by Perry (1961), by the Field Study in Portland (Collins, 1965; Collins, Emlen and Watson, 1969; Collins and Watson, 1970; Emlen, 1970; Emlen, Donoghue and LaForge, 1971; Emlen and Watson, 1970), and by Willner (1969), as well as by Ruderman (1968).

The Spokane and Portland studies were mostly white though covering a wide range of socio-economic levels among working mothers, while the New York study of Willner's was largely black and Puerto Rican. Of the twenty-two caregivers in the Pasadena study as of last summer, twelve were black, five white and five Latin or Mexican-American (only one of whom is bi-lingual, Sale, 1971, p. 47). Although Willner comes to unfavorable conclusions regarding family day care (1971) his data provide the same generally favorable picture of family day care as found elsewhere with the exception of substandard housing conditions. It is well to keep in mind Ruderman's finding (1968) that the community's general socio-economic character is a pervasive determinate of the quality of its child care services, though this may have been changed somewhat by programs such as Head Start and community programs in the War on Poverty. One can make no such assumption, however, with regard to the quality of care provided in informal family day care arrangements. It may well be true of housing conditions and the neighborhood environment, it may be true of opportunities, and of some possible child rearing influences (e.g., in the area of language development). However, the intrinsic character of the family day care arrangement I shall try to describe applied quite broadly to most of its users and to most of the resources used. The evidence is by no means in as to the part that socio-economic and ethnic variables play in family day care.

The Characteristics of Family Day Care as a Natural System

I should now like to describe family day care as it occurs in its natural state. What do we know about family day care as it occurs without the benefit of supportive services. This section should provide us with a background against which to discuss in the next section what we know about policy and direct service interventions that attempt to deal with the family day care situation. In addition to citing the problems let us look also at how well it works. It must have something going for it or it would not have become so widespread a phenomenon. First, then, let me list quickly some of the positive features of family day care, its advantages and strengths as a social arrangement as well as its benefits for the working mother as a day care consumer, for the caregiver, for the child, as well as for society and those of us who struggle with the problems of developing day care, child development and child welfare programs.

An Overview of the Advantages of Family Day Care

The advantages of family day care are listed in three major groupings. First all of the factors that contribute to the natural feasibility of the family day care arrangement as a viable social system involving a complementary fit in the benefits it offers to the day care consumer and to the caregiver. Secondly, the characteristics of family day care as a child-rearing environment with its considerable benefits for the young child. And thirdly, the advantages of private family day care as a national resource for day care that has unique benefits for day care planning and program development.

Why is family day care a feasible form of social arrangement?

--It involves a modest adaptation of family life for both of the families involved.

--It is a widespread cultural practice with developing norms and social acceptance.

--It is a neighborhood phenomenon affording convenience and a familiar situation.

--Transportation time and strain are minimized for child and parent.

--The resource affords the flexibility needed to meet varying work schedules of parents.

--It accommodates children of any age and all of the children in the family.

--It is economical for one or two children.

--The consumer can control the selection and participation process.

--It is a socially approachable and manageable resource for the day care consumer.

--It affords a tolerable degree of delegation of authority, care and nuturing role without serious threat to feelings of parental possessiveness.

--It is able to accommodate the mildly sick child if necessary.

--The economic need of the working mother who must join the labor force finds a complementary fit with the relatively low economic need of the caregiver who can afford to stay home because of her relatively higher family income, but who can use the extra $1,000 or $2,000 per year.

--The young family of the working mother who has children under six finds a complementary fit with the somewhat older family of the caregiver who completes her partially empty nest with day care children.

--Family day care results from a subtle process of self-selection between consumer and caregiver, allowing for idiosyncratic individualization of values, preferences, needs and patterns of adaptive behavior.

--Mothers and caregivers alike report satisfaction with the other's concern for the child, satisfaction with the child's adjustment, and with the arrangement generally, even though they may experience strains in the roles they perform in the process of maintaining the child care arrangements.

Why does the family day care arrangement provide a favorable child rearing environment for the child?

--It provides continuity of care for a substantial proportion of the children involved, and the possibility of a sustained consistent relationship with a nurturant caregiver.

--Because it is a viable, feasible social arrangement with which the mother and the caregiver tend to be satisfied, it has a generally positive, conflict-free atmosphere.

--The caregiver is apt to be mature, experienced, capable, warm, nurturant, and relatively child oriented.

--The caregiver's motivations for giving care tend not to be mercenary or economically driven but involve a modest degree of economic need and a considerable expressive need to be caring for children.

--The family setting and neighborhood locale provide a familiar kind of social and physical environment that affords an easy bridge between home and setting.

--Only a small number of children are typically found in private family day care arrangements--an overriding fact that assures a number of related benefits.

--It affords the possibility of individualization and responsiveness to the affective needs of the child.

--It affords the infant, toddler, or young child a high degree of accessibility to the caregiver.

--It facilitates a manageable separation experience for the child of the working mother.

--It affords a low-powered environment, informal, and unstructured, with opportunities for spontaneous play.

--It permits a relaxed atmosphere with minimum regulation and regimentation of the child.

--Caregiver is able to learn the special interests and needs of the child as well as the desires and styles of his parents.

--The caregiver child ratio is especially well adapted to infant care.

--The home and neighborhood offer socialization experiences well adapted to the interests of toddlers.

--The variety of new relationships involved provide learning and socialization experiences the child would not have at home.

--New learning and socialization experiences are provided by the cross-age associations typically present in the family day care setting.

Why does private family day care offer special advantages for the development of day care programs?

--The child development advantages of the family day care environment come naturally to the informal setting, but require considerable organizational effort to build into the day care center.

--Since most caregivers have child rearing talent and experience, they do not require additional training in order to provide ordinary acceptable levels of care.

--The child-caregiver ratios are such that the caregiver usually can be counted on to respond to the child's needs for attention.

--Caregivers and her neighbors respond protectively in cases of neglect or abuse, and provide society with a first line of defense against neglect.

--The caregiver is directly accountable to the day care consumer and feels accountable to the mother and to the child, as well as to her neighbors, for the quality of care that she gives.

--There exists a natural monitoring process based on observation and communication between the two families, with the child, and with neighbors.

--There exists an ample supply of potential good caregivers who are recruitable for informal family day care arrangements, thus constitute an unused national resource. (One need not and should not think in terms of overloading caregivers already being used.)

--The use of a family setting with its informal form of organization does not introduce overhead costs, zoning problems, or bureaucracy.

An Overview of the Disadvantages of Private Family Day Care

What are some of the disadvantages that deserve our attention? Again let us consider them in the same three groupings as we did for the advantages: those of family day care as a social system, as a child-rearing environment, and as a target population for day care programs.

For whom is family day care not a satisfactory form of arrangement?

--It is uneconomical for large families.

--According to going rates, caregivers do better financially if they take one child from two families than if they take two children from one family.

--It is inconvenient for large families; use of home care is associated with larger numbers of children.

--Many day care consumers have anxiety about finding, approaching and selecting caregivers; finding these arrangements can be difficult without help with information and referral.

--Some family day care users prefer other forms of care, especially home care, or not working at all.

--Many perhaps most working mothers and caregivers experience strain in managing their dual roles of working mother and homemaker or caregiver and homemaker.

--Such role strain is importantly a function of the long hours, of work and that the child must be in care.

--Many caregivers and users need to learn how to communicate effectively with one another to prevent mutual dissatisfaction with the arrangement.

--Some (relatively few) caregivers and users quite lack the interpersonal competence needed to communicate and manage successfully the relationships involved.

What are the drawbacks of family day care as a child-rearing environment?

--Caregivers may vary widely in their capacities and talents for child-rearing.

--The amount of educational enrichment, e.g., language stimulation, may be limited in some homes, suggesting a need for supplementary experiences either in the home or part-time at a child development oriented center.

--Arrangements sometimes lack stability, resulting in repeated discontinuity of care for child and need for stabilizing influences.

--Some care may occur in substandard housing and in unfavorable neighborhood environments.

--A small proportion of caregivers take too many children. This is a deviant group that calls for licensing and new intervention approaches.

What difficulties and challenges does private family day care present for program development?

--Since private, informal, neighborhood family day care is a widespread and viable phenomenon, it cannot be prevented or stopped, and most of its users are not recruitable to other forms of care; therefore it can be influenced favorably only by social policy changes, preventive programs, and support systems that will strengthen its operation as a natural system.

--It is a population that largely must be reached by approaches that can work effectively at the neighborhood level, e.g. Day Care Neighbor Service and the Community Family Day Care Project.

--Licensing seems reasonable but has been ineffective as a program for informal family day care. (In my opinion, it is inapplicable to the typical informal arrangement which rarely involves more than five children under six including the caregiver's own children, and usually less (Emlen, Donoghue and LaForge, 1971), but is both needed and applicable to homes taking in large numbers of children.)

--Overloaded homes, though relatively few in number, are a serious threat to the welfare of the children involved and are difficult to deal with effectively.

--In order to function well, private family day care needs as one support system, an information and referral program that is both centralized city wide and decentralized to the neighborhood level where most of information processing takes place.

--Private family day care requires direct purchase of service by the day care consumer, and public programs are reluctant to subsidize the consumer, preferring subsidies of child care resources or restricting the spending of funds for use only of certified homes or supervised placements.

--Private family day care's greatest drawback is the program-defeating attitude towards it by the public and professional world.

A Few Key Issues

a. Stability: Is Family Day Care Really a Viable Social Arrangement?

This is one of the primary questions we are addressing in the Portland Field Study. We were concerned about the discontinuity of care, turnover, and chaotic patterns of care. It appeared to us that family day care was perhaps an inherently instable form of social arrangement, and much of our research has concentrated on identifying the sources of instability and trying to think through ways to bring stabilizing influences to bear upon the processes involved. Those of you who have plowed through the data of our last report (Emlen, Donoghue, and LaForge, 1971) know that we have come to see this matter somewhat differently. While some of our samples have yielded median durations of under two months, or three months, when sampling from new or terminated arrangements of working mothers or from the contacts of the Day Care Neighbor Service which picks up arrangements no matter for what transitory purpose, our sample of ongoing arrangements was indeed characterized by a very respectable degree of stability. Fifty-three per cent of these arrangements lasted more than a year.

Now duration itself is not a sufficient indicator of stability nor certainly of quality. Duration can mean many things. Occasionally pathological relationships persist a long time, and short durations may be planful, sensible arrangements or even contribute to the child's experiencing variety that may have value. But most of us would probably be willing to make the assumption that a pattern of repeated changes in child care arrangements could adversely affect the child and that simple continuity of the arrangement itself is one of the necessary conditions for sustaining meaningful relationships, nuture, and socialization. We shall turn to other such dimensions in a moment; for now I should like to state the conclusion that family day care is a stable form of arrangement for a substantial proportion of users.

Our panel study data which have not yet been reported formally also tend to confirm this conclusion. Even though the median duration of these arrangements which were followed from inception to termination was three months, eighty per cent of them were terminated for extrinsic reasons rather than due to dissatisfaction with the arrangement, that is due to summer vacations, changes in residence and jobs--characteristics not so much of instability of the arrangement but of normal, practical changes in the circumstances of family life. Add to this the fact that the family day care arrangement is well adapted to short-term purposes, and we interpret our duration data as showing that the arrangement itself is not inherently unstable but an arrangement the life of which is highly contingent upon external conditions and the purposes for which it is used. The data reported by Perry (1961), Sale (1971), and even of Willner (1971, p. 33) are consistent with this conclusion, although Willner emphasizes the turnover in his interpretations.

The problem of interpreting duration data has plagued us too. Originally we were dismayed at the apparent overall discontinuity of care in family day care, but summary statistics such as median durations reflect so many legitimate reasons for a short arrangement that a two or three month median duration by itself does not look ominous to us anymore, especially when the sampling frame is arrangements that just began or just ended. By the same token, median durations of over one year are impressive even for those that were sampled from on-going arrangements prevalent at any given time and of varying durations when sampled.

On the other hand, there is a small group of day care consumers who repeatedly make one marginal arrangement after another. These women appear to lack some of the interpersonal abilities needed to cope with the day care relationships as well as other relationships in their lives. They make up a special population at risk that can be reached, however, through programs such as the Day Care Neighbor Service and deserve further research.

One of the unique virtues of neighborhood family day care is that there is a caregiver for everyone. The mysteries of the self-selection process sometimes take on the appearance of a natural informal child welfare service. We have found that some of the mothers who lead chaotic lives and who shun the services of social agencies as best they can gravitate to caregivers who, though they may look disreputable and unlicensable, have a special capacity to meet the mother's overwhelming personal needs and to accommodate her unpredictable behaviors to extreme degrees of flexibility altering patterns of life for the caregiver's entire family. These caregivers can bring about more stable conditions for the children than otherwise would occur. In effect, they provide a neglect-preventive service. Also the helpful third-party role of the "day care neighbor" frequently facilitates such stabilizing processes.

b. Flexibility, Self-Selection, and Social Exchange: What is so Unique about the Adaptive Character of Informal Family Day Care Arrangements?

Another way of stating the same conclusion about the viability of family day care is to say that the social interaction between the working mother and the caregiver within the arrangement is managed with considerable success, though with some exceptions. Let us examine some of the features of their social interaction which contribute to this success. For a more complete treatment of the subject, see Child Care by Kith (1971). Our study has led us to be impressed by family day care as a creative social achievement. For both the caregiver and the care user it is an adaptation of family life. For the working mother it is a way of acquiring "an extended family" within the neighborhood, with kith though not with kin, while for the caregiver it involves a modest and manageable expansion and modification of family life. Family day care is workable because for neither party does it require radical departures from ordinary behavior, experience, talents, or motivations.

In addition to the complementary fit in economic circumstances and stages of family development between mother and caregiver, family day care has a manifest feasibility as a social system that derives from its many faceted convenience for the working mother. A primary consideration is that the caregiver's home be near by in the neighborhood. In Portland, one study and a replication found seventy-two per cent and seventy-four per cent of arrangements within one mile of home, and beneath this statistic lies a relationship which Zipf (1949) calls the "principle of least effort"; we found that the cumulative percentage of arrangements increases as the logarithm of the distance (Kith, pp. 59-62). Of course, in California one would have to double any distances that normal people would travel! Sale found comparable percentages for two miles (1971, p.58).

However, the feasibility of family day care also depends in large measure on the capacity of the caregiver and her family to accommodate with flexibility the idiosyncratic needs of the working mother and her family, such as her hours, and work schedule, the age composition of her family, the health condition of the child, and the temporary or changing needs for care. Our study of the Day Care Neighbor Service also found family day care used for many special reasons other than working, with temporary short-term recreation and relief from child care responsibilities heading the list of reasons other than work for requesting day care.

Quoting from that report:

> One of the reasons it is important to recognize the heterogeneity of requests that come to the Day Care Neighbor Service is that these requests are not easily accommodated by organized day care programs, either by a day care center or by agency-supervised family day care. Litwak,* in arguing that family structure in the United States constitutes a "modified extended family," develops a "shared functions" theory in which it is asserted that the division of labor between bureaucratic organizations and the family is not based on functions such as assistance, child care, or education, but on the regularity with which a function is to be performed. The family carries responsibility for the irregular, idiosyncratic tasks while bureaucracies tend to assume responsibility for those regular and persistent tasks that will fit into formal programs for broad categories of people.
>
> Litwak's claims regarding the family apply also to the use of nonrelatives who are available in the neighborhood. Neighborhood day care arrangements are especially well adapted to meeting the needs of families for day care when those needs are unusual in nature and when the pattern of child care needed is either part-time or irregular and of short duration. One hardly presents oneself to a social agency to request day care for a few days while hiding from the boy's father, for going to church, for recreation, or for taking a vacation without the children. At the same time these special requests reveal the extent to which illness of the mother, the child, or the sitter can be a source of disruption of the child care arrangement and of need for an additional temporary arrangement. The stability of any kind of child care arrangement requires backup support when contingencies arise.

Emlen and Watson, Matchmaking in Neighborhood Day Care, 1970, pp. 55-56.

*Eugene Litwak, "Extended Kin Relations in an Industrial Democratic Society," in Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations, Edited by Ethel Shanas and Gordon F. Streib (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp. 290-323.

Family day care allows for a subtle process of self-selection to take place between consumer and caregiver, and allows for individualized patterns of adaptation for maintanence of the relationship. Based on individual values and preferences, family day care offers a choice and permits an individualized selection to take place. It allows for the achievement and maintanence of a desired degree of social distance, of cooperation and of control of the social interaction between the mother and caregiver. We found, for example, that the dynamics of their social relationships differ markedly depending upon how the arrangement began, that is whether they began as friends or whether they did not know each other before and discovered one another through a newspaper classified ad or a referral.

Between women who knew each other before the arrangement began, the friendship itself was the bond or social glue that held the arrangement together. The degree of continuing friendship was associated with the degree of satisfaction with the arrangement, while mere acquaintance involving perhaps a presumption on friendship was associated with dissatisfaction with the arrangement. When dissatisfaction occurs between friends it can threaten the friendship as well as the child care arrangement.

Those who started out with an initially contractual arrangement tended to develop a more extensive system of mutual satisfaction which were not associated with the degree of friendship. For those initially strangers it was the balanced exchange of satisfaction, a reciprocity of mutual benefits that served as a bond. Between strangers the norms more clearly encouraged discussing the practical instrumental conditions of the arrangement as the arrangement began and also as problems arose. Yet there was also freedom to regulate the degree of closeness or social distance with which they would be comfortable. Within the contractual context of this social arrangement friendships did develop and when they did they provided an extra bonus; the closeness was associated with an enduring arrangement.

Both types of arrangement, those between friends and those between strangers, though the dynamics of negotiation differed, nevertheless proved to be relatively successfully managed relationships, with a workable balance between closeness and distance; with enough communication, control and effective adaptive mechanisms for dealing with issues that arise; with enough shared values, norms and expectations, commonality of view, and approval of the other as a mother or as a person to permit congenial relations; with some balance of give and take or fair exchange between the families so that neither party feels continually exploited; with a degree of delegation to the caregiver of authority, control and nuturing role that is tolerable to the mother as without threat of caregiver possessiveness, yet satisfying to the caregiver's need to play her caregiver role in her own way; with an adaptation by the child to the day care experience that is satisfactory to both mother and the caregiver; and finally simply with elements of liking or attraction between the two women and between caregiver and child.

Though family day care arrangements may differ widely in what users and givers are looking for and in which their desires are achieved, are generally favorable. Satisfaction data from surveys (Perry, 1963; Ruderman, 1968; Low and Spindler, 1968; Emlen, 1971) are reasonably consistant. Reported satisfaction levels are high despite a number of strains. Our own studies are more detailed with respect to the specific sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Emlen, Donoghue, and LaForge, 1971). Our factor analytic work shows that both parties are able to discriminate readily between satisfaction on one issue and dissatisfaction on another.

Perceived satisfaction levels are high especially with adjustment of the child and with the other woman's concern for the child. Our studies of the social interaction between mothers and sitters in family day care has revealed a remarkable capacity for both parties to overcome the strains they report arising from competing role requirements of being working mother and homemaker and caregiver and homemaker. Despite these pressures they are able to create an arrangement in which they can report a high degree of satisfaction with the arrangement itself, with the adjustment of the child, and with each other.

It is important to emphasize these interactional characteristics because they raise important issues for practice. The question is how important is an optimum matching between mother and caregiver and caregiver and child either for making a stable arrangement or for having favorable effects on the child. We have collected the data for an attack on this problem and are in the process of analyzing them. I can only report preliminary impressions at this point which are that a subtle practice of self-selection and negotiation directly between the mother and caregiver does take place, and I would bet it is more likely to lead to optimum matching than could be accomplished on a rational basis by a professional person or any third party. In the Day Care Neighbor Service, however, we did find that it is possible to facilitate the natural processes by which self-selection takes place (Collins and Watson, 1969; Emlen and Watson, 1970; Emlen, 1970).

c. Group Size: A Dominant Determinant of Quality in Family Day Care as a Child-Rearing Environment

Just as Prescott, et al. (1967) found the size of the day care center a profoundly important variable in determining the character of group care as a child-rearing environment, so also in family day care it is likely that similar results will be found though the situation and the phenomena are on a very different scale.

Many of the favorable characteristics of family day care are made possible by the small number of children typically found in these settings. By the same taken the overloaded home looms large among the hazards of family day care not for its frequency so much as for its harm for those children who are affected.

To dramatize the potential impact of group size on the complexity of social interaction, consider the number of two-way relationships that are possible (Hare, 1962, Handbook of Small Group Research, p. 228):

group size	number of two-way relationships $x = \frac{n^2 - n}{2}$
1	0
2	1
3	3
4	6
5	10
6	15
7	21
8	28
9	36
10	45
15	105
25	300
50	1225

Naturally, because of this situation, the amount of communication possible per person within a group becomes sharply curtailed, as does the ability of a caregiver to attend to and influence what is going on in an individualized way. The larger the group the greater the need for social structure, for constraint and order, for supervision and leadership, for teaching skill and training and for educational programming, as well as simply for subgroups and additional staffing. The large homes tend to lack these additional requisites for quality program. The large family day care home is a deviant type of enterprise, commercially motivated and run more like a small business than like a family activity. On a prima facie basis it seems likely that this deviant subgroup of family day care offers a child-rearing environment that is grossly deficient and deserves special study of the settings and of their users. Feasible methods need to be developed also for putting them out of business, for controlling the numbers of children involved, or for bringing to these settings something that can improve what they have to offer.

This is a plea also to researchers interested in studying the effects of family day care on the development of children to take the variable of group size into account. Our data would suggest that there are really two quite different types of family day care--the normal type and the deviant type. The Westinghouse-Westat Study reported a mean size of 1.6 children per family day care situation. (Although I have reason to believe their figure is too low for artifactual reasons.) In our Portland study we found a mean of 2.35 total day care children under six and a mean of 3.30 total children under six in the home including the caregiver's own children. Only five per cent of our sample involved six or more children under six in the home including the caregiver's own children. Since the frequencies dropped off very rapidly after three children under six it suggests that a large number of children represents quite a different phenomenon. Intervention programs probably need to tackle these two groups in quite different ways and to treat them as different groups in studying the effects on children.

Demonstrations of Intervention Programs and Support Systems for Family Day Care

In considering demonstration projects that have addressed questions concerning interventions to improve family day care it is a problem to know what to include. A great deal of what has been done in family day care has not been studied systematically. Family day care as an agency-supervised program has been around for many years, standards for it have been articulated by the Child Welfare League of America, and some expansion of this form of care has occurred in connection with comprehensive day care efforts in many cities. Yet little research has been done to test whether agency family day care does effectively what it attempts to do. Radinsky (1964) in a follow-up study cited evidence that family day care provides agency clientele with an alternative to full-time twenty-four hour placement of children, thus preventing family break up. Wade (1970) in Milwaukie and the Family Day Care Careers Program in New York City (undated) represent efforts to integrate agency supervision with career lines and training in family day care as an anti-poverty and compensatory educational program, but without clear cut results yet so far as I am aware.

Among the more selective and focused educational intervention programs for family day care, Ira Gordon (   ) and Susan Gray (1970), deserve mention because they have added family day care to the settings in which educational interventions have been studied.

However, so little has been done that directly shows effects on the children, that I want to concentrate on discussing those programs that have demonstrated feasible ways of reaching the family day care population on a larger scale. Hopefully, through feasible potentially large-scale programs we can turn to research telling which programs also are effective in bringing about changes in the lives of the children.

One potentially large-scale program I shall not discuss is licensing. Norris Class will cover that subject and we shall be debating the issues. The evidence suggests to me that licensing is not a feasible program for reaching the great bulk of family day care arrangements and that we need research on what forms of regulation will work, for which groups, and why.

Subsidies represent another potential kind of intervention about which we might speculate in our discussion. What might we expect from subsidizing the day care consumer through the voucher system giving freedom of choice in selection of day care resources? And what might we expect from subsidizing the caregiver? Are there ways of subsidizing day care so that the children will actually benefit? My own opinion is that the scarce financial resources for day care should be allocated to subsidizing specific support systems the feasibility, and possibly the effectiveness, of which have been demonstrated--whether it is licensing, subsidies, reduced hours, neighbhorhood improvement, educational interventions, consultation, or information and referral. We need to know what it takes to make an intervention work and how applicable it is to which segments of the target population, as well as what its effects probably are on the families and children involved.

A useful way of sharpening the issues regarding approaches to family day care might be to compare and contrast the two demonstrations represented at this conference--the Day Care Neighbor Service and the Community Family Day Care Project. The staff from both are here and can speak for themselves, and

I think some of the similarities and differences are worth pointing out.

Most of you probably already are familiar with the two projects and I shall not try to restate the literature on them. Both represent neighborhood approaches to finding and strengthening private family day care arrangements. Both projects have found these arrangements accessible to influence though one involved a simpler model and the other is more comprehensive and varied in what it is trying.

Very simply the Day Care Neighbor Service involved finding some fifteen home-centered women who were providing family day care themselves and who also were discovered as the active person in their neighborhoods in helping their neighbors with babysitting problems. These day care neighbors were paid $25.00 per month and provided with expert consultation. The consultant not only discovered them but provided them with continuing support in their roles, identified problems and needs of particular children, and disseminated child development ideas. The objective was to improve the quality of privately arranged day care in neighborhoods by influencing the way in which day care arrangements are made and maintained. Specifically the service was designed to perform the following functions:

(1) To provide referral information and suggestions to families who are looking for day care resources.

(2) To recruit caregivers upon user demand.

(3) To facilitate the process by which matchmaking takes place between day care users and caregivers.

(4) To help caregivers and users deal with problems that arise.

(5) To respond protectively to neglect and abuse (an unanticipated function of the service).

The results of the demonstration showed that the service did work as a system performing the functions intended though with wide variations among the day care neighbors. The demonstration showed that the fifteen day care neighbors could "reach" in some sense some 882 children in a year through the network and processes of the service that costs out at around $40.00 per child. The service has limited objectives and is best seen as an adjunct to more comprehensive approaches. Its uniqueness lies in the fact that it uses natural systems of service delivery and its consultation method does not require neighborhood organization thus enabling the service to reach individuals who are reluctant to associate themselves with formal programs.

Both the Portland and the Pasadena projects have demonstrated that the users and givers of private family day care can be reached in a way that makes them accessible to the delivery of service. So agency-bound does thinking about delivery of service tend to be that it is always something of a surprise to find that a program of neighborhood sleuthing will indeed reveal the existence of the vast population of private family day care arrangements, and that once reached these people can be helped within the context of existing patterns of care. Though there are interesting differences between the Portland and Pasadena projects there is an overall similarity of the thrust of the two projects which is to go to the existing arrangements that occur naturally within neighborhoods and to help develop them rather than to set up competing facilities and try to recruit the users and givers of care to other forms of day care.

Both the similarities and the differences give one more confidence in the strenth of neighborhood approaches to family day care. In the Day Care Neighbor Service we leaned over backward not to disturb the natural patterns of day care behavior. We were primarily a research project and the Day Care

Neighbor Service served as one entreé into the neighborhood. As our literature pointed out the professional staff did not work directly with the working mothers and the caregivers but only saw and worked with the day care neighbors who in turn had direct contact with the users and givers of care. Our results, then, showed what happens with a minimum of intervention into the natural system of child care and with reliance on a natural neighborhood support system, whereas Pasadena's Community Family Day Care Project shows what can happen with a considerable amount and variety of influence on the day care arrangement and especially on the caregiver. The Pasadena project is a more multi-faceted effort consisting of more relationships, more interventions, more influences, and a more comprehensive set of influences. While the Day Care Neighbor Service involved a network of day care neighbors, each one worked alone without group involvement, and one-to-one relationships carried the influence process. In Pasadena, however, the caregivers are directly involved in the project headquarters, their use as consultants is highly reinforced by a variety of social experiences within the project. There also are students who visit and help in the homes as an important relationship which continues until indeed a relationship is formed between the students and the day care giver. And the student is not the only one who visits the home; so do visitors of many kinds.

It is not only the home of the caregiver that becomes visible in the Pasadena project. The visibility of the entire project is strikingly different from the Day Care Neighbor Service in which the service was sometimes so invisible that the users and givers of care did not know that the day care neighbor was a part of a service. In Portland the day care neighbors did not come into the project office. By contrast Pasadena has a storefront office to which people come in. The project itself then is visible as well its auspices, Pacific Oaks College, with a reputation of excellence in early childhood education as well as a reputation of respect for people which carry over to the community project. Thus, with the visibility of the project goes a kind of legitimacy that is especially significant for family day care since the quality of family day care has always tended to be suspect at best in the public mind.

What is interesting to me is that the Pasadena approach brings family day care out into the open more than our project did. This is especially evident in relation to the licensing process. Both projects placed little faith in day care licensing. Even though California has a stronger licensing law than Oregon it is well known that the law is largely disregarded in family day care. In Portland the subject of licensing was less likely to come up between day care neighbor and users and givers of care because the law did not apply to the usual handful of children and because the licensing program itself was less active. The Pasadena project, however, has a constructive linkage to the licensing process. At the same time that they pull the hidden arrangements into public view their emphasis is on the more important dimensions of family day care for the child without overemphasizing the relatively superficial and sometimes petty features that are dealt with in licensing programs. The Pasadena project not only has a finding process for family day care homes but facilitates the licensing process for homes that are found. Even licensed homes may be of doubtful quality, and this fact calls for the kind of consultative educational and organizational effort that the Community Family Day Care Project has for upgrading the quality of care provided. The Day Care Neighbor Service likewise addressed the upgrading of quality of care but in a more unobtrusive way, through consultation with the day care neighbors who in idiosyncratic ways exercised judgment in guiding the selection and matchmaking process and tried to influence harmful practices they encountered as part of a basic human protective response.

One of the virtues of the Community Family Day Care Project is that it offers a comprehensive approach in which it can address all types of day care including group care and family day care and varying alternatives in a mix of these types, such as a child in family day care going two days per week half day for an enriching group care experience. In addition they are learning about approaches to training and about what is involved in facilitating the organization of caregivers. The effort here is to stimulate an organizational movement that not only can serve its members to improve the quality of care but also to become a force in the community and in the state in promoting the interests in which they have a stake. It will be worth studying the development of this incipient organization and its ultimate impact on day care in a community.

CONCLUSION

I personally think the evidence supports the conclusion that the potentials of private family day care are sufficiently promising to justify our accepting it as a basic resource to which we could bring supportive services designed to strengthen and enrich it further. I believe the evidence supports the view that there are feasible ways of doing this. However, more approaches need to be tried and demonstrated through systematic research, and within the context of such approaches we need to demonstrate the effectiveness of interventions that actually show more favorable results for the children involved. The present state of research in family day care has concentrated on showing how it operates as a natural social system and on the characteristics it offers as a child-rearing environment. Ultimately we may see family day care become an arena for research that shows the measureable outcomes for children.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, Mary D. "The Effects of Maternal Deprivation: A Review of Findings and Controversy in the Context of Research Strategy." Deprivation of Maternal Care: A Reassessment of Its Effects, Geneva: World Health Organization, 1962, 97-165.

"Analysis of a Survey of Current Child Care Practices, Parental Needs and Attitudes in Massachusetts." Massachusetts Early Education Project, Harvard University, April, 1971.

Booklet on the Family Day Care Career Program. New York: Human Resources Administration, Community Development Agency, undated.

Bronfenbrenner, Uris, et al. Day Care U. S. A.: A Statement of Principles. Washington, D.C.: Office of Child Development, 1970.

Caldwell, Bettye M. "The Effects of Infant Care," in Review of Child Development Research. Vol. I. Eduted by Martin L. Hoffman and Lois Wladis Hoffman. New York: Russell Sage, 1964.

Chapman, Judith E. and Joyce B. Lazar. A Review of the Present Status and Future Needs in Day Care Research. Prepared for the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development, November, 1971.

Class, Norris E. Licensing of Child Care Facilities by State Welfare Departments. Washington, D.C.: Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Children's Bureau, 1968.

Collins, Alice H. "Some Efforts to Improve Private Family Day Care." Children, 13 (July-August, 1966), 135-140.

Collins, Alice H. The Lonely and Afraid: Counseling the Hard to Reach. New York: Odyssey Press, 1969.

Collins, Alice H. "Consultation Method as the Base for a Family Day Care Service." Paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, Chicago, Ill., June 4, 1970.

Collins, Alice H. "The Home-Centered Woman as a Potential Protective Service Resource." Paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, Authors Forum, Dallas, Texas, May 17, 1971.

Collins, Alice H. "Natural Delivery Systems: Accessible Sources of Power for Mental Health." Prepared for presentation at the 49th Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, Detroit, Mich., April, 1972.

Collins, Alice H., Arthur C. Emlen, Eunice L. Watson. "The Day Care Neighbor Service: An Interventive Experiment." Community Mental Health Journal, 5 (June, 1969), 219-224.

Collins, Alice H. and Eunice L. Watson. "Exploring the Neighborhood Family Day Care System." Social Casework, 50 (November, 1969), 527-533.

Collins, Alice H. and Eunice L. Watson. The Day Care Neighbor Service: A Handbook for the Organization and Operation of a New Approach to Family Day Care. Portland: Tri-County Community Council, 1969.

Costin, Lela B. The Training of Personnel for the Licensing of Family Homes in Child Welfare. A Final Report to Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Urbana, Ill.: The Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, 1965.

"Criteria for Assessing Feasibility of Mother's Employment and Adequacy of Child-Care Plans." Washington, D.C.: Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau and Bureau of Family Services, 1966.

Day Care: A Statement of Principles. Day Care Workshop, Office of Child Development. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Day Care of Children in Chicago: Needs and Resources, by Community Areas. Chicago: Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, Division of Planning and Research, Publication No. 1025, 1967.

Dittman, Laura L., ed. Early Child Care: The New Perspectives. New York: Atherton Press, 1968.

Emlen, Arthur C. Project Summary in Dale G. Lake, et al. "Applied Behavioral Science: Current Projects." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 5 (1969), 380-382.

Emlen, Arthur C. "Realistic Planning for the Day Care Consumer." Social Work Practice, 1970. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970, 127-142.

Emlen, Arthur C. "Neighborhood Family Day Care as a Child-Rearing Environment." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Boston, Mass., November 19, 1970.

Emlen, Arthur C. "Slogans, Slots, and Slander: The Myth of Day Care Need." A position paper on day care policy prepared for presentation at the 49th Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, Detroit, Mich., April, 1972.

Emlen, Arthur C. and Eunice L. Watson. Matchmaking in Neighborhood Day Care: A Descriptive Study of the Day Care Neighbor Service. Corvallis, Oregon: DCE Books, 1971.

Emlen, Arthur C., Betty A. Donoghue and Rolfe LaForge. Child Care by Kith: A Study of the Family Day Care Relationships of Working Mothers and Neighborhood Caregivers. Corvallis, Oregon: DCE Books, 1971.

Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. Federal Panel on Early Childhood. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Economic Opportunity, Department of Labor, 1968.

Foley, Frank A. "Family Day Care for Children," *Children*. 13 (July-August, 1966)

Garvin, Charles, et al. "Decision Making in the WIN Program: First Year Progress Report." University of Michigan School of Social Work, 1970.

Gray, Susan W. "Parental Environment of Very Young Children." Paper presented at Annual Conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Boston, Mass., November, 1970.

Grier, George. *The Baby Bust*. Washington, D.C.: The Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1971.

Grotberg, Edith H., ed. *Day Care: Resources for Decisions*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, June, 1971.

Heinicke, Christoph M. and Ilse Westheimer. *Brief Separations*. New York: International Universities Press, 1965.

Herzog, Elizabeth. *Children of Working Mothers*. Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, 1960.

Huntington, Dorothy S., Sally Provence and Ronald K. Parker, eds. *Day Care: Serving Infants*. Office of Child Development. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Johns, Jody R. and Robert S. Gould. *Day Care Survey 1970*. Bladensburg, Maryland: Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Westat Research, Incorporated, 1971.

Keyserling, Mary Dublin. "Day Care Challenge: The Unmet Needs of Mothers and Children." *Child Welfare*. 50 (October, 1971), 435f.

Kraus, Dorothy, et al. *Survey of Pre-School and Day Care Needs and Facilities in San Mateo County*. San Mateo County Office of Education, 1970.

Lajewski, Henry C. *Child Care Arrangements of Full-Time Working Mothers*. Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, Publication No. 378, 1959.

Litwak, Eugene. "Extended Kin Relations in an Industrial Society," in Ethel Shanas and C. F. Streib, eds., *Social Structure and the Family Generational Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965.

Low, Seth and Pearl G. Spindler. *Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, Publication No. 461, 1968.

Maas, Henry S. "Childrens' Environments and Child Welfare." *Child Welfare*, 50 (March, 1971), 132-142.

Mech, Edmund V. "Practice-Oriented Research on Separation in Child Welfare," in Miriam Norris and Barbara Wallace, eds., *The Known and Unknown in Child Welfare Research: An Appraisal*. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1965.

Milich, Cynthia, Elizabeth Prescott and Elizabeth Jones. *Group Day Care: A Study in Diversity*. Pasadena, California: Pacific Oaks College, 1969.

Minturn, Leigh and William W. Lambert. *Mothers of Six Cultures: Antecedents of Child Rearing*. New York: Wiley, 1964.

North, A. Frederick, Jr. *Day Care: Health Services*. Office of Child Development. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Nye, F. Ivan and Lois Wladis Hoffman. *The Employed Mother in America*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Nye, F. Ivan, Joseph B. Perry, Jr., and Richard H. Ogles. "Anxiety and Anti-Social Behavior in Preschool Children," in F. Ivan Nye and Lois Wladis Hoffman, *The Employed Mother in America*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Parker, Ronald K. and Jane Knitzer. "Day Care and Preschool Services: Trends in the 1960s and Issues for the 1970s," in *Government Research on the Problems of Children and Youth*. Washington, D.C.:" U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Parker, Ronald K. and Laura L. Dittman, eds. *Day Care: Staff Training*. Office of Child Development. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Perry, Joseph B. "The Mother Substitutes of Employed Mothers: An Exploratory Inquiry." *Marriage and Family Living*. 23 (November, 1961), 362-367.

Perry, Joseph B. "Mother Substitutes," in F. Ivan Nye and Lois Wladis Hoffman, *The Employed Mother in America*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Pittman, Audrey. "A Realistic Plan for the Day Care Consumer." *Social Work Practice, 1970*. New York: Columbia University, 1970, 142-148.

Prescott, Elizabeth. *Children in Group Day Care: The Effect of a Dual Child Rearing Environment*. Los Angeles Welfare Planning Council, 1964.

Prescott, Elizabeth. *Assessment of Child-Rearing Environments: An Ecological Approach*. Progress report prepared for Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Pasadena California: Pacific Oaks College, June, 1971.

Prescott, Elizabeth and Elizabeth Jones. Group Day Care as a Child-Rearing Environment. Pasadena, California: Pacific Oaks College, 1967.

Prescott, Elizabeth and Elizabeth Jones. "Group Day Care as a Panacea." Mimeograph, Pacific Oaks, 1970.

Prescott, Elizabeth and Elizabeth Jones. An Institutional Analysis of Day Care. Pasadena, California: Pacific Oaks College, 1970.

Prescott, Elizabeth and Elizabeth Jones. "Day Care for Children--Assets and Liabilities." Children. 18 (March-April, 1971), 54-58.

Radinsky, Elizabeth K. "Follow-Up Study on Family Day Care Services." Child Welfare. 43 (June, 1964).

Rowe, Mary P. Economics of Child Care: Testimony of Mary P. Rowe for the Senate Finance Committee, September 23, 1971. Cambridge, Massachusetts: ABT Associates, 1971.

Ruderman, Florence A. Child Care and Working Mothers: A Study of Arrangements Made for Daytime Care of Children. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1968.

Sale, June S. with Yolanda Ledon Torres. "I'm Not Just a Babysitter": A Descriptive Report of the Community Family Day Care Project. Pasadena: Pacific Oaks College, 1971.

Schienfeld, Daniel R., et al. Parent's Values, Family Network, and Family Development: Working with Disadvantaged Families. Research Report 6.9. Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research, 1969.

Stolz, Lois Meek. "Effects of Maternal Employment on Children: Evidence from Research." Child Development. 31 (December, 1960), 749-782.

Travis, Nancy E., et al. Bulletins of the Southeastern Day Care Project. Atlanta:Southern Regional Educational Board, 1971.

Trout, Bessie E. and Dorothy E. Bradbury. Mothers for a Day: The Care of Children in Families Other Than Their Own. Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, Publication No. 319, 1946.

Vernon, Elizabeth and Milton Willner. Magnitude and Scope of Family Day Care Problems in New York City. New York: Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, 1966.

Weiss, Eric B. They Carry the Burden Alone: The Socio-Economic Living Pattern of Oregon Women with Dependents. Salem, Oregon: Oregon Bureau of Labor, 1968.

Willner, Milton. "Day Care: A Reassessment," Child Welfare. 44 (March, 1965), 125-133.

Willner, Milton. "Unsupervised Family Day Care in New York City." Child Welfare. 45 (June, 1969), 342-347.

Willner, Milton. "Family Day Care: An Escape from Poverty." Social Work. 16 (April, 1971), 30-35.

Yarrow, Leon J. "Separation from Parents During Early Childhood," in Martin L. Hoffman and Lois Wladis Hoffman, eds., Review of Child Development Research. New York: Russell Sage, 1964.

Zener, Thelma. "Priorities for Office of Child Development Day Care Research and Demonstration Grants: FY72." 1971.

FIELD STUDY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD FAMILY DAY CARE SYSTEM
2856 Northwest Savier
PORTLAND, OREGON 97210
(503) 228-7263

WHAT DO MOTHERS AND CAREGIVERS WANT IN A FAMILY DAY CARE ARRANGEMENT?

A ROUGH DRAFT

Betty A. Donoghue
Research Associate

February 2, 1972

A Research Project of the Tri-County Community Council in Cooperation with Portland State University
Supported by United States Children's Bureau Grant R-287

FOREWORD

The following account of what working mothers and their neighborhood caregivers want in an arrangement was based on a unique source of data. From a panel study of 116 pairs of mothers and sitters who were followed from the beginning to the end of an arrangement (and on both of whom complete interview data were obtained), structured interviews were conducted. The author of this account supervised the interviewers, reviewed all schedules, made independent validty ratings, and checked all interviewer ratings for consistency and supervised the codings of the interviews. In addition approximately half of all of the interviews were tape recorded and she listened to all of them--332 in all (167 mother interviews and 189 sitter interviews, divided among the three waves of interviews). Most but not all of the interviews taped were selected on a random basis. Before analyzing the coded data, she recorded her impressions of the taped interviews in order to capture in this way, as an additional type of data, the values, sentiments, and role expectations of the mothers and sitters. Thus, this account is intended as an educated set of impressions to serve as a supplement to systematic analyses of response data, interviewer ratings, and hard data. It captures impressions that may have been lost by the standardized items and other data, and it provides an overview of what each party to the family day care arrangement seeks from it and succeeds in getting. It should be kept in mind that complaints are given a relative salience they may not deserve, since for the most part respondents reported being quite happy with their arrangements. Although the median duration of these arrangements was three months, eighty per cent were terminated for extrinsic reasons ~~and not~~ for dissatisfaction.

Arthur C. Emlen

WHAT DO MOTHERS AND CAREGIVERS WANT IN A FAMILY DAY CARE ARRANGEMENT?

INTRODUCTION

The mothers and sitters in this study had made private paid child care arrangements for at least one child under six in the sitter's home for ten or more hours per week. They were contacted shortly after their arrangements began and asked if they would consent to a series of three interviews about their arrangements.

The following notes are based upon impressions formed from listening to tapes:

(1) 55 mother and 65 sitter interviews about why they made this particular arrangement, what they were looking for, and what things they discussed when making the arrangement.

(2) 55 mother and 63 sitter interviews of ongoing arrangements that were one to two months old. This interview focused on the kinds of mother-sitter interactions that had taken place, how problems, if any, had been resolved, and how satisfied they were at that time.

(3) 57 mother and 61 sitter interviews done shortly after the arrangement ended. At this time reasons for the arrangement's ending, and sources and amount of satisfaction and dissatisfaction were discussed.

Respondents were assured that there was no way for the other party to find out what was said to the interviewer, that everything would be confidential. They were told and reminded that sitter interviewers and mother interviewers were not allowed to discuss cases to insure that no information could get back to the other party in that way. They gave every appearance of speaking frankly and freely about their current arrangements and their feelings about day care in general.

What do the Working Mothers Want?

Perhaps most important in considering what mothers want in a day care arrangement is a recognition of the reasons they need an arrangement at all. They may work for a variety of reasons, many of which are child oriented, whether financial, ranging from sheer necessity to wanting "better lives" for their children, or a desire to improve the quality of time spent with their children by having some time away from them. Some professional women such as pediatricians and social workers, work from a feeling of obligation to all children, not just their own. Whether a mother's reasons for working are altruistic or child oriented she needs to meet her obligations to her job, without being distracted by anxiety for the welfare of her children.

No matter how good an arrangement might be for them, it is of no use to the working mother unless it is available for the required hours and days, dependable on a day-in-day-out basis, within the price range she can afford, and to which she can get her child without undue strain in time, effort, or money.

Convenience of location is essential but has different meanings depending upon the mother's circumstances. In the same apartment house or next door would seem convenient for all mothers who have to take their children out of the home. A mother who has her own car has more freedom than one who has no transportation or who must consider where the sitter lives relative to bus routes on the mother's way to work. A mother who relies on public transportation and is carrying an infant, diaper bag, and purse plus leading a toddler must look very close to home for a sitter. Other mothers, who are constrained by having both school age and preschool children, need a place close enough to school for their children to walk to and from kindergarten. An arrangement that is manageable in the summer may seem impossible in the cold and wet of winter. Conversely, a school year arrangement may not be feasible in the summer when older children are home. Some mothers solve this problem by routinely making a summer arrangement for a high school girl to come into the home.

Finding a sitter who is available at the hours needed is not a problem for the mother who works straight 8 to 5 hours, but mothers who put in much overtime, work split or rotating shifts, such as beginning telephone company operators, waitresses, or hospital employees, find their choice of sitter narrowed by the demands of their jobs. They do find good sitters who will accommodate to the unusual hours, but there are many others who won't or can't because of their obligations to their own families.

Mothers who were heads of one parent families and earned low wages had some choice of sitters who were willing to lower their usual rates because of the mother's need. But even if they could affort to pay more, most mothers paid a "going rate."

Once a mother has determined that a sitter meets the requirements of pay, hours, and distance, how does she decide whether she wants this woman to take care of her child? Many rely on the reassurance of choosing a friend or a sitter recommended by a trusted acquaintance. A large number, however, choose strangers for a variety of reasons. Some mothers just don't know anyone to ask. Others would not feel comfortable telling a friend how they want their child cared for and prefer the control over the arrangement that doing business with a stranger gives them. Some have specific requirements in mind, not available among known friends. One chose a sitter who would let the children "mess" because she thought it good for them but could not bear it in her own immaculate home. A few mothers of one-parent families want sitters who have husbands so that their children will have some experience of a two-parent family.

Most mothers picked caregivers partly on the basis of numbers, ages, and sex of other children in the sitter's home. Some wanted only one child, same age and sex as their own. Others, esp-cially when the child was beyond the toddler age or when the arrangement was for two or more children preferred more than one other child at the sitter's. None mentioned actively seeking sitters who cared for very large numbers of children, i.e., six or more. Some mothers of small infants wanted a sitter who had no other children at home during the day to distract her from care of the baby. One mother's doctor recommended that she find a day care home with no other children because of her son's sensitivity to communicable diseases.

Other requirements were mentioned less often than numbers of children. Some mothers wanted sitters who had fenced in yards; others mentioned toys and play space. Some stipulated that they expected a sitter to stay home when the child was there, while others were delighted with sitters who led active lives and took the children along to store, library, park, or meetings. But in selection of a sitter these mothers exercised a great deal of control in the kind of environment they wanted for their children, evidencing understanding of the needs of the child and of themselves.

Most of the above conditions of an arrangement can be checked by phone before ever meeting the caregiver. Others, such as kind of neighborhood or general appearance of sitter's home, can be observed without entering the house. But most mothers do meet their sitters at least once before beginning an arrangement. Perhaps the most frequent reason mothers gave for selecting the sitter they did choose was child oriented and depended upon actually meeting the sitter. "She likes children." "He took to her right away." "I liked the way she was with her own children." "She seemed to be interested in him (the child)". A sitter who shows concern by asking about a child's routines, favorite foods, if he has a Linus blanket, etc., goes a long way to reassure a mother about leaving her child there.

Dependability of sitters was not often mentioned as a requirement for making an arrangement. By and large, sitters are there when needed and mothers assume this will be so. One aspect of dependability that many mothers take almost for granted is that sitters will care for sick children. Mothers can and do stay home with a seriously ill child but cannot adequately meet their work responsibilities if they must be absent every time a child has a cold, a stomach upset, or is recuperating from a communicable disease. Both mothers and caregivers assume that sitters will provide the special care needed at such times, giving medicine, keeping the child quiet, or whatever is required.

A frequent concern of mothers at the beginning of an arrangement was that sitters exercise fair but effective discipline. The expressed concern was not that the sitter might be cruel to the child but that she might let him "run wild." Mothers not only reported talking about discipline at their initial meeting with the sitter, but at the second interview when the arrangement was about a month old it was frequently mentioned as a further topic of discussion. Apparently it was a sensitive area for both mothers and sitters, and a great deal of communication took place concerning it. Sitters often told mothers when they had punished the child, both the nature of the misdeed and corrective measures applied at the time. In the case of continuing misbehavior such as biting or hitting, the sitter often asked the mother's preference in how to handle it or suggested a method she had found effective with her own children; then they would agree on a single consistent way for both to deal with it. It is interesting that although discipline was both an initial concern and a matter to be checked on during the first month or two of an arrangement, it was infrequently mentioned at termination and was never given as the reason an arrangement ended.

Once the child is at the sitter's, the mother wants to be free while at work to give her full attention to her job without nagging guilt or worries that her child might be wet, unhappy, or even neglected. Mothers are alert to signs that their infant is not getting the proper physical care. Does he seem hungry when he should have been fed? How many diapers were used? How does he react to being left with the sitter each day? Older children are often questioned about what happened at the sitter's as well as their feelings about being there.

But the most important reassurance a mother gets is through open communication about her child with her caregiver. She wants continuing evidence that her sitter likes her child and is interested in his welfare. Conversations were usually reported as brief if there were no problems to be discussed; but even a few words about the child's day, how long he napped, what he ate, successes or failures with toilet training help the mother to feel that the sitter is paying attention to the needs of the child. Often mothers and sitters take a few minutes to exchange information about the child's new accomplishments, difficulties they were both concerned about, e.g., learning to play with other children, and take pleasure from the results of their mutual efforts in his behalf. The absence of communication can be a source of great distress to the mother. One of the most wistfully plaintive remarks heard on any tape was that of a mother who said at the end of her arrangement, "She didn't tell me what went on with the children."

Occasionally a mother mentioned that her sitter left her child with a substitute caregiver, neighbor, husband, or sitter's teenage child, without letting the mother know. When a mother reported this to an interviewer, she often seemed reluctant to discuss it with the sitter. It had usually happened only once and the mother did not want to jeopardize an otherwise excellent arrangement by complaining about something that might not happen again. At the same time, she was concerned and would have welcomed the sitter's mention of the substitute as an opportunity to express her unease about it. For some mothers this is a gray area where she is not certain that she has the right to insist that the sitter be present all the time. Of course other mothers did take the initiative and tell their sitters, who as often as not had not even thought to mention that they had to go out ahile, and that the mother wanted to be told in advance when the sitter had to leave and who would be in charge of the child.

When real or suspected problems exist, feeling free to ask about them can be important to the success of an arrangement. Mothers in general seem to feel more free than sitters to react to certain things. If a sitter reported that she had let the child go to the corner store, the mother could say that she would rather not have the child do that. If the child tells his mother that something has happened at the sitter's, the mother usually asks the sitter and very often finds that the child has reported only part of the story or has misconstrued what went on. Mothers can and do lay down the rules for feeding, request more frequent changing, establish bounds for a child's freedom, but, within the limits set, leave the sitter free to handle the child as she thinks best.

The important thing to mothers is that they feel they know what is going on and that they do exercise some control over the day care situation. If the child is in a situation she likes, is being handled the way she wants, and is happy there, a mother can go to work not only with an easy conscience but peace of mind about her arrangement.

What do Caregivers Want?

Why do sitters sit? Most of the sitters in our study are women who were content to stay home, who (over eighty per cent) feel a woman should not work unless she really has to, but who like the extra money they can make while being at home themselves. As might be expected, they said they did it because they like children. Some have older children with perhaps one or two still at home. Their primary responsibilities are seen to be to their own families. Some, for this reason, discontinue sitting each summer so that they can be free to do things with their own children.

For the average sitter, in this sample, the first requirement for a baby-sitting arrangement is that it not be disruptive of family life. The hours and number and ages of children are more important than money in determining whether she will make a particular arrangement. Some want only infants; others refuse infants and will take only children the age of their own. Most take only one or two families and have about three preschool children in their homes.

It is therefore important that the day care child fits in with other children. This does not preclude a child with problems, but the kind of problems and how amenable they are to the sitter's intervention is crucial. A child who has a negative influence on the behavior of the other children in the home may be tolerated if his behavior can be modified, but not if behavior of other children deteriorates due to his presence.

Related to effects on family life is the mother's pick up and delivery of the child at agreed upon times and her notification of the sitter when her plans change. A sitter may feel unable to plan her day if she is waiting--not knowing if or when a child will come. Children who come at noon or during nap time were spoken of as disruptive--disturbing the routine, making it difficult to handle children who had been at the sitter's since early morning. A child left late is an inconvenience particularly if, as in many cases, the sitter's husband doesn't mind if she sits as long as it is only while he is gone from the home. Many sitters plan to spend their time with the children in the late afternoon but to have day care children gone by the time they are busy in the kitchen preparing their own family's dinner. A mother coming to pick up a child at this time may be an annoyance to the husband and a reason for dinner being burned or late. Incidentally, how often the mother stops to talk, and how long she spends at the sitter's were thought initially to be good indicants of the relationship between mother and sitter. At this point, there seems reason to doubt that mother spending a great deal of time talking to the sitter is good for an arrangement.

Sitters want to know details relevant to their care of the child and do not resent the time necessary to talk about these. They want mothers to let them know in the morning when anything unusual has happened: not enough sleep, breakfast eaten, medicine to be given, temporary restrictions on a child's activity, etc.; and in the evening they want to be able to tell the mother the child had a good day, how he got that bruise or scratch and how the sitter handled it. They particularly want the mother to communicate changes in her plans to leave or pick up the child.

Some sitters do enjoy chatting with the mother, perhaps a half hour or more, but most see a lengthy visit as an intrusion. If the mother stops in the morning when other children are arriving, she takes the sitter's attention when the sitter feels it should be available for the children, greeting them, helping them get started on the day's activities.

The evening is the time of greatest strain. Children are tired and hungry, the other mother is arriving for her child and a mother who settles down for a social chat at this time disrupts the routine.. But primarily sitters complain about the effect of mother's presence on the behavior of the child at this hour. Her appearance is a sign that it is time to go; he wants her attention; he is hard for the sitter to handle when mother is there. Many sitters agonize, "Should I or shouldn't I take the initiative in handling him while mother is present?"

Sitters do not feel kindly either toward mothers who call during the day to check up on the sitter or just to talk. This takes them from the children who need to know the sitter is in control, and checking up implies the mother does not have confidence in her sitter.

There are many subtle variations in role definition and a few arrangements end because mothers and sitters see the role differently: the amount of affection a sitter should give the child, the division of her attention between her own and the day care child, the amount of time she should spend playing with him, whether she stays home all the time, takes the child out with her or leaves him with a substitute sitter. These are a few of the differences in role ascription that can cause trouble between mother and sitter if expectations differ and neither is willing to give in on some particular issue.

Basically, sitters feel that their job involves taking adequate physical care of children left in their care; keeping them fed, napped, changed, safe, and happy. It is equally important that the day care child become adjusted, be reasonably content to be at this sitter's, both for practical reasons involving the sitter's duties to family and other day care children and because his rejection of the sitter or his inability to get along with the group is a reflection on her adequacy as a day care giver. Besides, the sitter gets satisfaction from doing her job well.

A new day care child presents a challenge to the sitter. She must overcome his feelings of strangeness, learn his needs, teach him the rules of the house, and, hopefully, arrive at a state of mutual affection and understanding. For a normal child at least a week, maybe more, is needed before all begin to feel comfortable with the altered situation. Perhaps one sitter's comment throws light on this subject. "Breaking in a new child is just too hard. These children are used to each other now; we all get along well; no I don't think I'll get a new one to replace the one who left." What if the "breaking in" process does not go according to expectations? It represents a failure to the sitter. Only a few of the most experienced babysitters seemed aware that sitter=child "misfits" were to be expected and such an arrangement should be terminated quickly. Occasionally a sitter would explain to the mother why the child did not fit into the group and in addition find her another sitter where the child would not, for example, be too young for the other children or the only girl in a group of boys.

The above discussion refers to normal children. If a sitter knows from the mother or concludes from her observation that this is a child who has special problems, she may take on the task of his care with the hope and expectation that she can help him. Needless to say, the shy, withdrawn, neglected or slow child is far more likely to be accepted by a sitter than is the acting out, destructive child. His behavior conflicts with her first need, that a day care child not be a disruptive influence on the other day care children or on family life. Realistically, a sitter who is responsible for two or three small children and her household chores during the day cannot give one child her undivided attention. If she does, chaos results. One sitter kept two such children from the same family and was pleased with the changes in their behavior while she had them. She was young, optimistic, and had no children of her own. Eventually she gave up the children, ostensibly because she was pregnant and had a heart murmur so had to conserve her strength; but the last interview revealed a great deal of discouragement because the children's behavior was returning to its former level, due, she felt, to a worsening of their home situation.

This brings into focus the mother's role in the sitter's feeling of accomplishment. The ideal situation for the sitter is one where the mother takes good care of the child at home and actively cooperates with the sitter in working out agreements about how to handle him. Perhaps one of the most bitter, though not frequent, complaints of sitters is that their work is wasted if the mother does not follow through. It is discouraging in any job for one's work to be ruined by someone else's indifference, and sitters see the job of babysitting as a team effort that requires mother and sitter working together to produce a healthy, happy child. One person cannot accomplish much if the other does not do her share. This becomes most obvious in the care of babies and toddlers. Sitters sometimes complain that they work hard to clear up diaper rash, only to have the child returned to them each Monday morning with the diaper rash back. Toilet training causes the same kind of frustration.

"It doesn't do any good for me to work with him to keep him dry, if she doesn't do anything at home. Each week I have to start all over." A sitter for a retarded child was even more discouraged. "I got him to the point he was dry almost all the time. I didn't have him trained; he had me trained--but he was dry. I had him eating with a spoon instead of his fingers. But she didn't try at all, and he just went backward every time he was home."

The average sitter takes pride in the job she is doing. She would like not only cooperation from the mother but some indication that she is doing her work well. Adequate development in a happy child is frequently all a sitter needs to make her feel her efforts are worthwhile. Perhaps sitters of school age children find fewer intrinsic rewards in the child's development, but for sitters for the younger age group we studied, this is a very important source of satisfaction, from teaching the youngest to accept solid foods to getting the oldest to learn to tie his shoes before starting kindergarten. They do not, by and large, see this as a teaching role, but part of a sitter's job and much more of it may go on than was ever mentioned to interviewers.

A third need of sitters is modest but fair pay for the jobs they do. An item they were given, "I think sitters are usually not paid enough," has as many sitters disagreeing as agreeing with it. For a single child whose mother works five days a week, the average pay to the sitter in the Portland, Oregon, area is $3.00 a day or $15.00 a week. When the sitter has the child ten hours a day, this figure results in a gross hourly wage of thirty cents an hour. For two-child families the average rate is $4.50 to $5.00 a day, making it harder for mothers of multiple child families to find sitters and cutting down the pay of sitters who will sit for these mothers.

Out of this the sitter usually has the cost of one meal, occasionally two, and snacks for the child. There are the indirect, almost never mentioned, costs of utilities and wear, tear and breakage of home furnishings. Infrequently a sitter provides breakfast as well as lunch, often not as part of the original agreement. She may keep the child when the mother has to work overtime, not always for an extra charge; a few do the laundry for babies because "it is more convenient."

Why then is there such a split of opinion among sitters as to whether they are paid enough? Some sitters answer on the basis of the work they do; others on the ability of mothers to pay. Some regard their sitting income almost as "found" money, since they are home anyway; others look on sitting as a business which provides a definite supplement to the family income. The "average" sitter is not distinguished by any one or any particular combination of these attitudes. She may wish she made more money, feel that her services are under-valued; but her suggestions more often veer toward thoughts of government subsidies than to requesting more pay from the mother. Many a sitter during the interview stopped when she came to the item about being paid enough and explained to the interviewer that she knows from her own experience when she was a working mother how little a mother has in take-home pay after taxes, social security, transportation, clothing expenses and babysitting fees. Sitters are particularily solicitous of mothers who are "going it alone" and some will reduce fees based on ability to pay.

Perhaps one reason sitters are not up in arms about their rate of pay is that they are private entrepreneurs in a competitive market. There are many children who need babysitters, but they are available only if the sitter does not price herself out of the market. A sitter can be particular about which children to take, but not about the price set upon her services.

There is a "going rate" for sitters and even the mother who could afford to pay a great deal more does not do so. If, as is possible, this rate came into existence based on what the "average" working mother is willing or able to pay, it remains there even if the mother gets a raise or has a better paying job. Sitters must be at least partially aware of the numbers of other women who want to or must stay at home and to whom an extra $65.00 a month that they can earn without even stepping outside their front doors looms as a powerful inducement. It can provide extras for themselves or their families, a sense of individual worth that comes in our society only when one's services are deemed worthy of pay, and (if the right age) the day care child can be a companion for the sitter's preschool child.

Whether or not the sitter feels the rate of pay for sitters is adequate, there are aspects of day care that arouse resentment out of all proportion to their rate of occurrence. Sitters spoke with feeling of these matters whether they occurred yesterday or in an arrangement ten years before. Few things about a child care arrangement anger a sitter as much as feeling that the mother is taking advantage of her. She resents a mother who brings a child still in his wet night diaper and leaves the sitter to clean him up for the day (aside from loudly expressed righteous indignation about the effect this has on the child on a cold winter morning); she resents a mother's habitually dropping the child off with a request that he be fed breakfast since the mother is late; she resents mothers who do not bring their children with never a word to the sitter; mothers who don't pay when they said they would, or even worse, mothers who disappear without paying at all. They resent mothers who don't pick up on time, especially without any notification. A sitter most resents being forced into a situation to which she might have agreed if asked, without any say about it. She may fume, but she won't leave a child wet or hungry once he is there; she'll find something to feed him or put on him if mother didn't bring bottles or diapers; she can't put him out of the house if the mother doesn't come; she'll take care of him, give him supper, or postpone her family's dinner until the mother arrives. But most assuredly, she will resent being exploited.

A sitter's resentment of a mother who does not cooperate or who won't listen to what the sitter wants to tell her about her child is another instance of her feeling exploited. "Why should I bother when she doesn't care? After all it's her child." Even the few sitters who take a child "because I worry about what would happen to him if I didn't have him," get to a point where their resentment of the mother's neglect, whether material or emotional, overrides their satisfaction in helping the child. One did end such an arrangement with the expressed hope that the mother would take better care of her child, that the sitter's willingness to make up for the mother's inadequacies only served to make it easier for the mother to ignore the needs of her child. Even though the child's welfare is mentioned as being most important, there is a bit of the resentment felt by people who are conscientious in meeting their responsibilities toward those who don't--and get away with it.

Perhaps because the sitters were talking about their jobs and because they were the ones with the children all day, as a group they were more vocal and more explicit than were mothers about what an arrangement should and should not be like and especially what mothers should do to make the job easier.

In our study, most sitters were happy with the mother's concern for and care of her child. They overwhelmingly agreed with the item, "She is a good mother." In these cases the sitters found it easy to talk to the mother because the problems centered on the child and their mutual concern for him. Sitters were less likely to feel free to tell the mother when they were upset about her behavior. One just does not cast aspersions on another's quality of mothering. For the sitters, the interview provided an opportunity to ventilate some pent up feelings about working mothers, of whose working they don't approve anyway, and to stress their own child-centered concerns.

CONCLUSION

There is an overall congruence between what mothers and sitters want in an arrangement. Each wants the other to be concerned about the child, to treat him fairly and with affection. Each wants to be able to talk about the child and to have easy communication about his needs and progress, but even more important, each wants the other to communicate about the child, and to have the other be pleased and express her appreciation of the way the child is cared for. Both want to be informed, in advance if reasonable, about changes in plans, to be treated fairly and with consideration. Mothers want to feel some degree of control over their child's day care situation, and sitters want mothers to live up to the contract and not take their sitters for granted. In most of our arrangements, these conditions were met to a sufficient degree that everyone was happy.

While these initial impressions gained from listening to taped interviews are but an initial and subjective form of data, all of the mother and sitter interviews, taped or not, were coded and are at present being subjected to multivariate analyses for a formal and objective report of findings.

SESSION I

Session one was titled: Present Realities in Family Day Care and was chaired by Arthur Emlen. It centered mainly on the problems that the conferees encountered in their work in this field, but the second thing that emerged was a general description of family day care and its special properties.

The problems that were identified are all related to one general goal; that is to "produce a more favorable child rearing environment through family day care." All these problems and their solutions seemed also to be firmly rooted in the community. There were some problems about image; for example, the low status of family day care mothers. It was concluded that a family day care mother, with a good opinion of her commitment and of the service she is providing, can give better care; and that it is important to change community attitudes:

Byrd: *We try to give the child love, attention and all that we have to offer in our home along with a family environment. But there are so many ways they feel like we are not doing a good job and would like to see it go down the drain.*

Emlen: *What kinds of things do you need to make your job easier and better and more effective?*

Byrd: *Cooperation of the community so they could stop thinking that we are just a group of mothers sitting at home while some mothers are working and receiving their money for putting dry diapers on wet babies or feeding them food or keeping them from getting hurt, because we really do more than that in a day care home. A lot of times, I think the community feels this way because they think so many day care mothers have just a 7th or 8th grade education, and they don't feel like these people have enough to offer their children.*

Emlen: *So you're really talking about changing the community attitudes about what you are doing?*

Byrd: *Right. If we could do that then we wouldn't have any problem because this is where it starts....*

Horvath: *Primarily I think we need more publicity at all levels nationally to get out of this baby sitting notion. I wish we could sit a little more sometimes!*

There is a widespread lack of recognition of the day care home as a place where children have learning experiences. The general public, and even many professionals tend to think of child care centers and nursery schools as places that provide learning and to think of day care homes as places where children just play or watch television:

Greer: *........ But the way I got around some of his pent-up frustration was to start recycling and let him stomp those cans and get some of that stuff out of his system. One day in recycling we had held over a can from the day before and there were dead ants in the can. Oh, what happened to the ants? Oh, let's see*

> *now - what could have caused it? Hmmm. Maybe the ant had too much sugar; maybe the juice was too sweet. This thing went into a whole routine about dental care and went on for about three days, at the child's instigation of a question. And rather than overwhelm him with information, we would go on to other things and come back to this. I think we need that kind of thing that we can pick up on a continuing basis, that involves so many aspects of education that one could not put a label on. This is hand-eye coordination - big deal! But there was love and time taken to go through this thing and to keep that thread of continuity........*
>
> *I'll just prepare this project in advance for next Tuesday, knowing that hand-eye coordination is the thing that works. How can you put a label on loving, caring - these kinds of things? Let him sit on your lap while you tell a story about this ant that ate too much sugar. You can't specifically label the kinds of things that go into any one activity in the home, nor do I care to --- I would like to enlighten someone else about some of the things that do happen in day care homes.*
>
> *We don't lock them on the back porch, contrary to popular belief. We don't lock them outside for five hours at a time, nor do we lock the doors and keep them in watching TV. We do things; we live with them, I think is the best way of putting it. They're just like another child in the family; what does a mother do with her own kids in the home? That's exactly what we do - even if they're not our own.*

There are also problems that arise from trying to bring about change through political involvement:

> *Lipsett:* *........In our area we have a day care parents' organization; Santa Clara County has them; San Mateo has them; and I know Los Angeles has some. It's time now to organize parents up and down the State in family day care into a State organization. And I think we've got to have something like that to get some of these things that they need - some of the specialists - and try and try within the system. I think that they should be working politically.*
>
> *Sale:* *I do, too. If you don't work politically, you're dead.*
>
> *Greer:* *And if you work politically, unfortunately the thing that we are all about - which is children - gets neglected. If you're on the phone half the day, trying to keep the organization going, you're neglecting the children.*

There was a great deal of discussion about the need for tangible community support. There appear to be many areas in which community organizations or agencies can be of direct help to day care mothers and the children they care for; not the least of these are self-help organizations of day care mothers. The community can help with health services, referral systems, the use of centers or nursery schools to provide a mixed model experience for older pre-schoolers, and with the problems of insurance, liability, etc.

Health services were a major concern:

Gomez: *Where I got help was through the Health Department of the City of Pasadena. The nurse will come and look at the child for you. You can call them any time. They are very interested and very glad to help.*

Peters: *I think mothers get caught in this terrible problem that the day the kid gets* a *102 temperature is the day that she's got something to do for the boss or that she's used up her sick leave or that something else happens and she is in a hell of a mess. And I think we've got to take care of sick kids - not only in the family day care homes, but in day care centers. And I've been preaching this doctrine for years. And I'm concerned because I don't think using some health aides of the kind that they're setting up in Berkeley is a practical solution. I think they're just setting up another non-system.*

Horvath: *Well, the problem with the Berkeley system is that it's not the community..... Albany's only about 50,000 and I know the health nurse personally. She's not just a figure; she's just one..... If this 'coming-in' person would be related to the school, and the child would have seen her or the mother would have met her through the teacher or a parent conference ..... I think the Berkeley problem is it's size. They could have conferences where the parents could meet the nurses that are going to be available; why not? It's a matter of setting it up and thinking about it some more.*

Peters: *I think it's a matter of developing some kind of health service that is relevant to the system and not trying to fit kids into our present system, which is having health care scattered around in doctors' offices and clinics and other unavailable places that require an awful lot of extra trying and long hours of sitting.*

Referral systems were also discussed at length:

Emlen: *How would you relate what you do with a centralized information service?*

Davis: *I'd have a central area - a walk-in place - that's known in the community, where anyone needing a day care arrangement could come in and where you'd have all kinds of listings..... Part of the matchmaking service is to be able to know something about the homes and to be able to give the mother a choice.*

Cager: *What we found with day care consultants in each of these districts - which would be 23 or 24 persons who were responsible for that particular area - eventually, if they stay in that position long enough, they would get to know something about that particular community. But their referrals did include or should include not only family day care but also centers - whatever day care resources might be available in that particular community. But then they were also* *responsible for attending community meetings so that they were sort of a community contact person. The problem is that we do have substantial staff changeover so we don't build on what should be the kind of person who becomes known in the community as being available to get that kind of information around.*

Lipsett: *I don't think any of us have a good way of working out referrals. I work in social service in Contra Costa County and there - like in most other counties - we offer referrals which have to be mostly names, because we are starved for staff to do it. We had worked it out; we had a community aide full time who got to know the mothers and did a very good job of the matching process. All the licensed workers could do this but we are starved for staff. And all the Federal money, it's true, is going toward the centers and very little is helping us to work better with day care homes. I think most of the counties have this problem.*

Emlen: *I think we really have to accept the fact that there are just a tremendous variety of ways in which people get together and that any kind of information referral system has got to take all these into account: whether it's the use of the telephone, which some people will do and some won't; the use of word of mouth; the use of third parties and varieties of informal channels as well as formal ones. As I look at continuing day care, I think that one of the key missing links is the information and referral process - not only in relation to all of the supporting services that are available, but also with respect to the finding process in the first place. We really need to strengthen this through having centralized information and referral sources, as well as adding to it and linking up with it all the kinds of fantastic activities that you people mention.*

Mixed model experiences were also seen as an area where community support was vital:

Prescott: *Don't we tend to overlook the usefulness of mixed models? Here in Pasadena, and I'm sure this is true in Portland, a number of children attend Headstart for a half-day program and the rest of the time they are in family day care; which, for children who are getting ready to enter kindergarten, probably makes for some nice bridge building between home and the life of the community; and that tends not to get talked about at all.*

Horvath: *Day care children are excluded from many programs because the day care mothers can't participate - in Albany and Berkeley many of these programs work on a parent participation basis. They're funded by the State but the parents have to participate by attending adult school; and if you're a day care parent taking care of five children of different age groups, very often the teacher doesn't want you to participate with your other children. You've had it!*

Sale: *Well, in our Project we have six places that we purchase in a cooperative nursery school. Maybe it's an unusual nursery school - the family day care mothers are welcome to bring their other children, even the babies and toddlers. They do bring the other children and they do work in the co-op one or two days a month, depending on how many children they have filling the places; so it works very well.*

Byrd. *And at that nursery school the mothers are doing something; they're taking cooking or sewing; you know, a group of mothers is doing something while the day care children are away from them; and it really helps us because it gives you a little while to be away from them and do something with other mothers; and you discuss problems that you might be having with the children. It's a joint process. It helps both ways. It gives the children other children to be around..... At the day care home they're in a small little group all the time.*

Insurance and liability problems were also scrutinized:

Prescott: *This whole question of legal liability - it seems to me that this is the real problem in taking care of other people's children; and if you really start taking seriously what conceivably could happen in terms of legal liability, you probably wouldn't touch a child. This bothers me.*

Gomez: *We have a policy for $8 that covers us through the County licensing bureau. We have the insurance program and they offer a policy that only costs $8 a year and it covers every child that you take care of, except your own.*

Horvath: *You need another one in addition to that - liability - a more expensive one. The policy runs to something like $25 per month and that covers - supposing the child has an accident and it is serious enough to produce some kind of incapacitation and the parents sue you. The same people are offering this through the County office.*

Greer: *There is justification for an organization of licensed day care operators. If there is an accident and the parent is irate and claims negligence in taking care of the child, he would think twice about bringing a suit before an association in the place of an individual. You're united. They have to fight this united group.*

Donoghue: *What about financial feasibility? Your organization would make insurance against legal action more reasonable, wouldn't it, because you could get all the members insured as a group for a much cheaper rate.*

Horvath: *Well, this man didn't want to go into that. We talked with him at the time. We want some insurance for ourselves, you know, like accident insurance; and we'd like to have it on one of those policies like you have in companies where all the steady employees are covered. We would like to see something like that happen to day care operators, because - we can be in an accident as well as the children.*

It is often extremely difficult to identify existing community resources. Some of the preceding material has already revealed the obstacles that are encountered in the fields of health services and referrals, due to the general lack of knowledge about what help is available:

Horvath: *There are so many resources in every community that are not tapped. Nobody knows they're there and they're not being used to their full advantage. I discovered accidentally, for instance, that in Berkeley there's a rap session for parents at a psychiatrist's office. Four or five psychiatrists - and you can go and cry on their shoulders about the problems of the kids; and I think this is good for day care mothers. I'm sure you have these things everywhere, except you don't know they're there.*

Peters: *There is no communication anywhere about what resources are available in any of these areas; it's only enterprising gals like you who go out, determined to find out and get them.*

Horvath: *I decided I wanted to go into day care and I knew that I needed a license. It took me about three days to find out where to call to get the license.*

The conferees reviewed the problems growing out of agency separatism. It was felt that failure of community agencies to work together gives parents fewer alternatives and children a poorer quality of care than they might otherwise experience:

Peters: *In California and in North Carolina, where I worked before, the family day care homes were completely separate from the group care and there was no cross-fertilization - no contact. The licensing was different; the supervision was different; there was no connection.*

Emlen: *There are separate organizations in most cities. One can't go to one agency or go to one kind of program and have a range of alternatives.*

Peters: *The parents had nowhere to go and no way to find out what the possibilities were.*

Lynch: *And it seems to me unless we're able to head it off we're really going to find enforcement of separatism; because in meeting with Headstart directors of Southern California on Wednesday, I really sensed a great deal of hostility toward family day care. I think they are very threatened by the idea that family day care tends to become an even more predominant type of arrangement; and they don't see where you can have both types in combinations. I know we have a lot of work to do to convey this - that there could be combination types of programs and that parents will be allowed to have the prerogative of choosing from a variety of programs.*

The subsidizing of day care was also explored; there were some divergent points of view on this subject. No one opposed subsidy, but there were different opinions as to who should receive subsidy and how it should be paid. A great deal of concern was expressed about safeguarding the freedom of choice of both the consumer and the caregiver. It was generally agreed that subsidy should result in better quality care.

Nye: *The problem that even a person who is all for family day care acknowledges - they see it and they acknowledge it and they don't like it - is the occasional one that tries to take care of too many kids and doesn't do a good job. I may be wrong, but I am making tha assumption that the only reason they are used is that they are the rock bottom level in terms of price; and if that's true then maybe a subsidy could be used to control the bad family day care offering - even eliminate it from business because the mother wouldn't be forced to use it but could pick from good day care.*

Bernstein: *If one subsidizes day care mothers, one might get a number of effects. First of all, with that subsidy you would have to meet minimum standards of care; secondly, the kind of home where you have one mother trying to take care of ten kids might be eliminated because, perhaps, that mother had to take care of ten kids just to make a living wage, because the going rate is so low. The going rate in Pasadena is about $15 to $20 per week per child. To have a decent day care home you want to take 2 or 3 children, at most, in addition to your own. And you know that means your child care income has to be a supplemental income to someone else's in the family. You cannot - if you are a woman alone and would, in fact, prefer to stay home and make day care your source of income - you just can't do it. And I think that perhaps you could upgrade the standard of care by making it unnecessary to take so many children.*

Kresh: *I'd like to ask a question about the mechanism - whether you actually give the money to the parent after the parent makes a selection or whether the money goes to the day care mother. This would be my preference because there is no guarantee that the mother would use the money for child care; but this way she still has the freedom to make her selection and then the money is paid directly to the day care mother.....*

Cager: *The day care mother can require that the mother make the payment or send the money prior to the time the care is given, but you're violating a freedom of the mother in saying we're going to give this money here to this person. Now if she so chooses to have the money go that way, then that is another way of handling it; but the way we provide care - whether it's in a private center or where there's family day care - is that the mother makes the decision as to the kind of care she wants, where she wants it - whether she wants the money to come directly to her or whether it goes to the day care mother.*

Smith: But if the money goes directly to the caregiver, in my mind it might somewhat diminish 'power' - for lack of a better word - the natural mother would feel she would have in making commets or changes or corrections.

Sale: What would happen if it were done similarly to food stamps and there were child care stamps?

Emlen: If the money were earmarked and could only be spent for certain categories of services purchased?

Sale: It would have to go for child care but then, again, it protects the parents' choice.

Emlen: But you still choose the form of child care and the particular person or resource that you want?

J.Nicholie: Negotiate the money. You might want to pay over and above that; you might want to put some of your own money with that - which you'd be free to do.

Nye: There's a big advantage in having the control in the mother that wants the care rather than a direct subsidy to the caregiver, because then you've got, in fact, to inspect and license and supervise; whereas what I am suggesting is that if you give control over that to the mother so that she can move around and pick out the good centers, then the bad ones are going to be eliminated; and you wouldn't have to have an inspector around there snooping.

Greer: I don't mind the aspect of snooping. I would not in fact want subsidy because I don't want to be told how to operate - I want to pick up on cues from the kids. Furthermore, the minute the milkman, the postman, Virginia (Rigney) - my licensing case worker - or anyone walks in, every child needs everything he hasn't had for six months. I cannot carry on a decent conversation. I'm there to take care of the children, and the fewer disruptive elements I can have in a child's day, the better it is for the children; therefore, the better it is for me; therefore, I would not want direct subsidy.

Emlen: You're saying really the same thing that the day care consumer says in her way - that you want some control over the selection process and the negotiations that go on as to whom you are going to take .....

Kresh: The mother using the services is the one really being subsidized. After she picks you, then the payment comes to you; that's different than you receiving the subsidy.

Horvath: That's happening now and there's quite a bit of hassle in collecting. Furthermore, the State establishes what they're going to pay, and I feel that that is infringing on my freedom to run the business the way I want it. I think that all children are worth the same, and the fact that one mother only makes $1.69 an hour doesn't mean that the child is any more or less valuable than the one whose mother makes 10¢ more an hour. It's the cost of the service.

Mayes: Well, I'm trying to see if this wouldn't work: If your clients were subsidized according to their needs - that way you could still charge the poorer mother $20 a week because she has $15 of subsidy; and you're not having to take the brunt of it.

Emlen: I think there is something lost in the process if you're really setting up a dual system so that some people carry around their own cash and some people don't.....the consumer is not a free consumer in the same sense.

Horvath: The people who are in a hassle are not the ones who are making $18,000 a year; the ones that are in a hassle are those making $5,000 a year.

Gomez: Why shouldn't their children have an education the same as the person who earns $20,000? I mean - we would save on education if they started at the beginning, where they should.

Emlen: It seems to me pretty clear that direct subsidy to either the users or givers of care is not going to be a sufficient kind of program and that monies must really be allocated to supporting the whole range and varieties of support systems that we've talked about today. Each one of these really makes a unique contribution that's got to be funded in some way - and not rely on one measure or another to carry the whole weight that's inappropriate to that source.

SESSION II

GROUP AND FAMILY DAY CARE: A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT

Elizabeth Prescott

Prepared for
Family Day Care West - A Working Conference
Pacific Oaks College
714 W. California Blvd.
Pasadena, California

February 18-19, 1972

Research supported by
Children's Bureau, Office of
Child Development, U.S. Dept.
Of Health, Education, and Welfare
Grant #R-219 (C-6)

GROUP AND FAMILY DAY CARE: A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT

Impassioned advocates of more and better day care for our nation's children characteristically have talked as if group care were the only acceptable form of developmental day care and that existing forms of unsupervised arrangements were, at best, custodial. In their enthusiasm they also have implied that group care could be provided for all of the nation's children. Aside from issues of desirability, it seems important to assess the realism of this proposal in terms of current patterns of day care use and also of eventual costs of an extensive system of group care.

Who Uses Group and Family Day Care

Studies of day care use consistently confirm that the most common form of day care is in-home care by a relative or another person (47%). Although little is known about this form of care and it will not be discussed here, it is important to remember that in-home care accounts for nearly one-half of all day care use. Thirty-one percent of care provided is care in someone else's home, while the group day care center accounts for only 6% (Profiles of Children, 1970). 1/

Group care as it now functions is most practical for a mother who works regular daytime hours and lives within manageable commuting distance of a center. Furthermore, she needs germ-resistant children between the ages of 2 and 5, or possibly older if extended care is offered. Our experience repeatedly indicates that use of group care is highly selective according to ordinal position in family and that about 86% of children enrolled in group care will be only or youngest children. At present, in-home or family day care is virtually the only available choice for mothers with children under age two, for mothers working unusual or irregular hours, or for mothers who do not live near a group care center. Group care usually is impractical if the mother's family includes an infant and other children. As family size increases frequency of in-home care also increases. 2/

1/ The remaining 16% of mothers work only during school hours or keep the child while working.

2/ For more detailed information about day care use see Emlen (1970), Ruderman (1964), Low and Spindler (1968).

Although every day care center conceivably could offer service at all hours for children from birth upward, the effort and expense would be staggering and it is doubtful that centers could be made accessible to every neighborhood, especially in areas of low density such as those which characterize most of the far West.

The Relative Cost of Group and Family Day Care

The yearly costs per child reported for group care have ranged from a low of $400 - $1300 reported by the Westinghouse Study to $1295 - $3895 reported for exemplary models by Abt Associates (Chapman and Lazar, 1971). Most assessments have set costs about midway from $1200 to $2500. Cost of care varies with the amount of service provided. Provision of medical care, night care, infant care, transportation, and other special services all raise the cost of care. In addition to yearly operating costs the initial investment in land and buildings must be considered. 3/

Costs in family day care for independent arrangements between mother and sitter undoubtedly vary widely. The range reported for Pasadena was $114 - $1170 per year with an average of $1040 (Chapman and Lazar, 1971). The costs of a family day care system with built-in support services probably approaches the cost of group care. In family day care, unlike group care, the cost does not vary with age of child. Infant care in group settings costs considerably more than care of children over age two. Provision of night care in family day care also does not increase costs.

Family day care undoubtedly can respond more quickly to changes in community demand. In evaluating the Family Day Care Career Program in New York, Abt Associates commented, "The swift and steady growth of the system is characterized by remarkable responsiveness to community need without loss of organizational stability." (Abt Associates, 1971, Vol. 1, p. 64).

Mothers' Satisfaction with Day Care

Surveys of mothers' satisfaction with care all report fairly high satisfaction with their out-of-home arrangements. Ruderman reported that 53% of mothers using group care voiced no dissatisfaction, 17% moderate or high dissatisfaction. With care in someone else's home, no dissatisfaction was 41%, moderate to high dissatisfaction 31% (Ruderman, 1964). Low and

---

3/ Evaluating cost of care is a complex issue. For a careful discussion of the differences in methods which lead to discrepancies in cost such as those found in the Westinghouse and Abt figures, see Rowe (1971).

Spindler (1968), as part of a 1965 census, reported 9.6% of mothers dissatisfied with care in someone else's home, 8.2% as dissatisfied with group care. 4/

Statistics on satisfaction according to type of care gloss over the variety of reasons why a particular arrangement is or is not viewed as satisfactory. Often the degree of satisfaction is related to the way in which the caretaking arrangement fits the unique needs of an individual family. In this respect day care services differ markedly. Although there is considerable variation among group centers in breadth and flexibility of services, family day care can more easily adapt to individual family needs, while good in-home care permits the family to function with minimum disruption.

Evidence on costs and usage appears to indicate that an adequate day care system should not be limited to the group care option. Family needs for care take many forms and will vary from one community to another. For these reasons it seems unwise to promote one type of care to the exclusion of others. Families need the availability of a variety of options including mixed options such as nursery school and family care.

The Issue of Quality and the Effects of Day Care

At present, there is little information available on the effects of day care, either positive or negative. Children in exemplary programs show short term gains similar to those found in Head Start. Long term effects have not been established. The assessment of outcomes of day care involves consideration of a complex interlacing of variables which must include differences among children and the impact of home life. It is possible, however, to make some assessment of quality of care. Policy statements on day care frequently describe quality in terms of a custodial - developmental continuum with custodial providing only protection and attention to physical needs while developmental includes the whole range of services such as education, medical and nutritional supervision, and services to parents.

Our definition of quality care in a full-day program has been that it should substitute for a good home.

> A good home provides a setting in which love and respect among individuals of different sexes and different ages can be dependably experienced by the child, and in which care for his physical needs is accompanied by care for him.
>
> A good home also provides age-appropriate learning experiences by giving the child an environment characterized by variety and opportunity for sensory experience, which can be explored

---

4/ Our survey of 219 mothers using group care also produced 8.2% dissatisfied with care (Prescott, 1964).

> by the child in his own time and in his own way. In substituting for the home, a good day care program will make every effort to provide considerate attention to the particular needs of the individual, offering him sufficient opportunities for personal attention and personal choices to balance the demands for his conformity to group behavior patterns.
>
> (Prescott and Jones, 1967, p. 53-54)

In testimony to the Senate Finance Committee in 1971 Mary P. Rowe also used the criteria of home substitute as a definition of developmental day care.

> Developmental care provides at least the same amount of care and attention available in a good home with the full range of activities suitable to individualized development.
>
> (Rowe, 1971, p. 2)

In assessing quality it is also possible to look for conditions which are positively or negatively associated with quality as defined. In a previous study we used this approach for examining quality in a random sample of 50 day care centers. Our criteria for quality were teacher behavior which was high in encouragement and low in restriction and in routine guidance and children's responses which were enthusiastic and involved (Prescott and Jones, 1967).

Our findings based on this approach have been summarized by Chapman and Lazar as follows:

> Size of Center: is directly related to the quality of the program. Centers of moderate size, between 30 and 60 children, tend to be of highest quality. Quality declined in centers of over 60 children, even when space and staff quality were high. As centers increased in size, they became more sterile; the administrative complexity tended to increase the possibility of an impersonal environment and non-individualized schedules, rules, etc.
>
> Auspices: There did not appear to be any great differences in the quality of the programs related to auspices, although in proprietary centers they found child rearing values and practices to be less discrepant with those of the parents. Proprietary centers were more concerned with pleasing parents. Family day care seemed to offer more intimate, relaxed experience and greater flexibility in caring for infants and toddlers than center based day care.
>
> Staff: . . . they report quality of teacher performance to be directly related to the type and amount of staff training,

> . . . Staff of quality day care programs were judged to be more child-centered, and more frequently to use non-authoritarian styles described as nurturant, warm, friendly, sensitive, relaxed and individual-oriented than staff of day care programs of less high quality.
>
> (Chapman and Lazar, 1971, p. 14-15)

In a study of 20 exemplary programs Abt Associates replicated our findings on auspices and on center size (Chapman and Lazar, 1971).

Another finding from our study was discovery that there were marked differences in the way in which centers structured their daily program. In one type of format children regularly were given considerable freedom to choose among activities. In the other type teachers made most of these choices. The first format we have labeled open structure, the second format closed structure.

In our current study, we have observed samples of children in open and closed structure group programs and in family day care homes and compared them with children who attend half-day nursery school and spend the remainder of their day at home.

In selecting our sample we chose 14 centers, 7 open and 7 closed structure, under a variety of auspices with a community reputation for quality. Our criterion of quality for family day care homes was willingness to declare oneself as a giver of care by participation in the Family Day Care Project. The "good home" sample consists of children who use Pacific Oaks half-day nursery school from two to five days a week and spend the remainder of the day at home with mother. These children come from intact homes where concern for provision of a good child-rearing environment is high.

Six children were selected from each of the 14 centers and one child from each home setting. Every child was observed from 180 to 200 minutes in one day, usually two hours in the morning and one hour in the afternoon. All children were between the ages of two and five years. Our observation schedule was designed to describe the child's mode of activity every 15 seconds. These units were recorded in and are grouped into an activity segment matrix so that we can examine the child's experience at two levels of organization.

Differences Among Child-Rearing Environments

How Do Children Spend Their Time?

The first question which we attempted to answer was What do Children do in day care? We began by identifying time used for involved play, as opposed to time spent finding something to do, or moving from one activity to another. We labeled a child's day according to four categories.

Activity Segment: Time spent in an activity which lasted four or more minutes.

Official Transition: Time required by routines to move from one activity to another. Examples are toileting, waiting for lunch, going outside.

Unofficial Transition: Time required by a child in moving from one activity to another.

Abortive Activity: An activity segment which lasts less than four minutes.

Table 1 shows the differences in the way children spend their time. In closed structure centers nearly one-fourth of a child's time is spent in the routines necessary to move from one activity to another. Home settings produce larger amounts of abortive activity than do group settings.

TABLE 1

THE WAY CHILDREN SPEND THEIR TIME

AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT IN:	TYPE OF CENTER			
	Closed Center (N=42)*	Open Center (N=42)	Family Day Care (N=12)	Nursery School-Home combination (N=14)
Activity segments	63.4%	70.2%	75.5%	70.8%
Official transition	23.5	10.4	2.6	3.9
Non-official transition	2.7	3.6	4.7	4.4
Abortive activity	10.4	15.8	17.2	20.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*N = number of children observed

Initiation and Termination of Activity Segments

Since we were concerned with individualization we looked for a series of indicators of its occurrence. The source of initiation for the beginning and ending of the child's activities seemed to be indicative of individualization and of opportunities for autonomy and initiative. The terms used in Table 2 appear repeatedly in our data and have the following meaning.

Pressure: Child is expected to comply with adult request.

Initiation: A suggestion is made, compliance is not required.

Spontaneous: Child initiates on his own, no adult or child input recognizable.

Natural Ending: The activity clearly has a natural endpoint and child stops the activity when it is completed.

TABLE 2

INITIATION AND TERMINATION OF ACTIVITY SEGMENTS BY TYPE OF CARE

INITIATION OF ACTIVITY SEGMENTS	TYPE OF CARE			
	Closed Center (N=42)	Open Center (N=42)	Family Day Care (N=12)	Nursery School-Home combination (N=14)
Adult pressure	58.2%	20.0%	13.5%	8.6%
Adult initiated	9.4	23.0	21.7	27.5
Initiated by another child	1.0	4.6	6.4	5.0
Spontaneous	25.1	45.6	52.4	50.5
Unclear or other	6.3	6.8	6.0	8.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TERMINATION OF ACTIVITY SEGMENTS				
Adult pressure	56.9%	20.5%	14.4%	6.5%
Adult initiated	10.9	20.3	13.8	19.4
Initiated by another child	1.6	3.7	5.9	5.1
Spontaneous	20.3	41.9	46.8	55.5
Natural ending or unclear	10.3	13.6	19.1	13.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Pressure is highest in closed structure group care, lowest in the home-school combination, while the spontaneous category is lowest in closed structure centers. Individualizing care often means helping a child get started with an activity by offering it as a possibility. This possibility is markedly absent in closed settings.

Amount of Adult Input

The amount of attention from adults also seemed to be an important indicator of individualization. We tallied the number of times the child being observed obtained adult input and recorded whether it was directed to him individually or to the group. There is a marked difference in adult input according to type of care. See Table 3.

TABLE 3

AVERAGE ADULT INPUT BY TYPE OF CARE

AVERAGE ADULT INPUT	TYPE OF CARE			
	Closed Center (N=42)	Open Center (N=42)	Family Day Care (N=12)	Nursery School-Home combination (N=14)
Instigation to individual	23.4	26.2	49.6	64.9
Pressure to individual	48.3	18.3	23.9	8.5
Total	71.7	44.5	73.5	73.4
Instigation to group	19.8*	10.2*	4.4	4.3
Pressure to group	19.7*	4.1*	0.8	0.5
Total	39.5	14.3	5.2	4.8

* The average input in these categories is computed from an N of only 30 children because this dimension was not added until the data were partly collected.

Adult attention to the child as part of a group may be informative, but it is not personal. Adult pressure may be personal, but it is seldom individualized, since pressure is almost always concerned with compliance to routines and demands of the setting.

The following was a relatively common example of a sequence of adult pressure inputs, numbering four in this case.

1. John - time to come in.
2. John, time to come in.
3. John - get off the trike. It is time to come in.
4. John! Get off that trike. Right now!

A child in a closed structure center averaged the largest amount of adult input (including group). Interestingly, the total amount of individual input was almost identical for closed structure and home settings and was markedly lower for open structure group care. Instigation was much higher in the two home settings and highest in the home-school group.

Play Structure

Each activity segment was rated according to the extent to which it permitted alternatives or a variety of possibilities or directions of the play. For example, activities such as play dough and doll play are rated as open, swings and tinker toys as relatively open, and working puzzles and tracing of templates as closed. Closed structure centers offer many closed activities while homes characteristically offer activities which are more open.

TABLE 4

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE BY TYPE OF CARE

ACTIVITY STRUCTURE	TYPE OF CARE			
	Closed Center (N=42)	Open Center (N=42)	Family Day Care (N=12)	Nursery School-Home combination (N=14)
Closed	39.7%	16.7%	7.0%	10.7%
Relatively open	34.5	35.4	33.0	40.8
Open	21.9	45.4	56.0	48.5
Does not apply	3.9	2.5	4.0	0.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Amount of Mobility

There are differences in the amount of physical mobility permitted in settings. See Table 5.

TABLE 5

MOBILITY BY TYPE OF CARE

MOBILITY	TYPE OF CARE			
	Closed Center (N=42)	Open Center (N=42)	Family Day Care (N=12)	Nursery School-Home combination (N=14)
Little mobility	51.7%	36.1%	29.6%	42.9%
Indeterminate	33.5	41.2	41.7	38.8
Much mobility	10.9	20.2	24.7	18.3
Does not apply	3.9	2.5	4.0	0.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Closed structure group programs often set strict limits on mobility. Homes seldom do. For example, if the activity is watching TV, or coloring, often in a group setting no one is permitted to move from a sitting position for the duration of the activity. Homes seldom require this degree of immobility. A child watching Sesame Street at home often will roll around and turn somersaults or move his coloring from table to floor.

The table of mobility indicates, as expected, a high percentage of limited mobility in closed structure centers. In these centers adults select many activities which require of children long periods of sitting. This figure drops for open structure programs and for family day care. The fact that it is high for the home-school combinations offers some interesting evidence on the presence of an educational component. In this setting adults offer many small muscle activities which the child is free to use - paper and pencils, cards, games such as Candyland are readily available and children may spend much time involved with them. The high percentage of abortive activity shown in Table 1 is partly accounted for by the burst of physical activity and rapid exploration which often occurs for these children when they switch from one limited-mobility activity to another.

Content of the Activity Segment

Every activity segment was labeled by the observer according to the major content of the activity. Singing songs or reciting nursery rhymes would be coded as imitation of prescribed patterns, the tracing of templates or naming of colors as cognitive activities, carpentry or painting as creative exploring.

Table 6 again indicates that structured transitions are an activity of significant frequency in closed settings. Creative exploring rises steadily across settings. The frequency of cognitive activities is slightly higher in homes than in open structure group settings. The largest part of the cognitive component in the home-school combination was contributed by the home.

TABLE 6

CONTENT OF ACTIVITY SEGMENT BY TYPE OF CARE

CONTENT OF ACTIVITY SEGMENT	Closed Center (N=42)	Open Center (N=42)	Family Day Care (N=12)	Nursery School-Home combination (N=14)
Listening, watching	9.7%	12.6%	14.2%	17.3%
Large muscle activity	7.8	15.2	16.0	9.8
Imitation of prescribed patterns	7.7	2.5	1.3	1.0
Creative exploring	16.2	20.5	23.4	28.4
Conversation, informal, formal, affectionate	2.7	3.7	6.4	3.6
Testing limits, social skills	6.5	5.5	6.9	3.4
Dramatic play	8.5	11.2	10.1	11.8
Doing work	2.1	1.8	1.1	1.8
Cognitive activities, standard, unusual	11.7	5.5	7.8	13.8
Eating	9.4	12.4	10.6	7.9
Structured transition	17.7	9.1	2.2	1.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Mode of Children's Behavior

Data from the 15-second coding of child's mode of response are not yet available. However, I predict that the following modes of response will occur with greater frequency in family day care and home-school settings than in group settings.

Active elimination or negation

Example: Child reaches for John's cupcake. John says, "Stop that!"
Child removes his juice cup and shakes head as teacher leans over to pour juice.
Child says, "You be the baby." Mary says, "No."

Receives positive input from adult such as help, information, praise or comfort, both task and affect oriented.

Example: Mary sits on couch talking while attentive adult combs her hair.
Adult comes over and hugs John.
Adult shows Jane how to get paste to stick.

Perceptive - reflective

Example: Child lies on his back in cargo net while it is swinging, moving slightly to motion of net.
Child puts finger in paint can. Holds it there, then moves it only enough to perpetuate the tactile sensing of paint moving against skin.
Child listening to story shows postural identification with action being described, but continues central attention towards story teller.

Copes effectively with social constraints, spontaneously shows understanding of the social system and/or effectively asserts own desires within social system.

Example: Adult says, "I want everyone to wash up now." Child says, "I just washed when I went to the bathroom. Can I read a little longer?"
Child gets glass from cupboard, juice from refrigerator and expertly pours juice.

Child offers sympathy, help, affection

Example: Child comforts another child who is crying.
Child puts arm around another child.
Child displays tenderness to an animal.

Predicting To Other Variables

The data which have been presented are descriptive of the child's behavior and adult relation to it. We have also collected considerable data on the nature of the setting, and the number and kinds of people in it. As we have stated in previous writings (Prescott and Jones, 1970), behavior settings (in the present discussion, family homes and day care centers) appear to possess inherent regulatory features that stem from the purposes for which the settings exist, their physical attributes, and the number and kinds of persons present in them. These aspects of a setting determine to a great extent the activities and types of behavior that will probably occur within its boundaries (Barker, 1963). When a setting is not optimal for certain kinds of activities and behavior, such actions are not likely to occur unless the adults involved are highly motivated to bring them about and are exceptionally skilled in doing so.

Although our data are not yet compiled we have found marked differences among settings in the aspects described above and we consider them to be regulatory of behavior which can occur.

Spatial Differences

We have identified some spatial dimensions which differ markedly across program types. One that is particularly pertinent to a comparison of home-school settings is the softness rating, which is based on the presence or absence of the following criteria.

1. Child/adult cozy furniture: rockers, couches, lawn swings, etc.
2. Large rug or full carpeting indoors
3. Grass which children can be on
4. Sand which children can be in, either a box or area
5. Dirt to dig in
6. Animals which can be held and fondled
7. Single sling swings
8. Play dough
9. Water as an activity
10. Very messy materials such as finger paint, clay, mud
11. "Laps", adults holding children

Closed structure centers characteristically offer none of these opportunities, while open centers more commonly make them available. Homes abound in softness - they have couches, pillows, chocolate pudding to help make, water play in the back yard in hot weather. Dogs and cats are common in home settings and are not found in group settings. Privacy also is commonly available in home settings, and is rarely found in group settings unless carefully built in by adults. (However, bad behavior sometimes gives a child the privacy of an isolated corner or the director's office.)

Contact with Outside World

Another distinctive feature of the homes we have visited as compared to centers is the frequency of occasions which bring community people into the home or take the child out into the community. The need to pick up a child means a daily walk to the school, a chance to visit the classroom and watch the older children. Trips to the market, bank, doctor's office are common. Some group centers plan such outings, but these trips are not easily undertaken with the adult-child ratios which now prevail, and much adult effort goes into supervision rather than informal conversation.

Number and Kinds of People

There are marked differences in the numbers and kinds of people in the various settings. Closed structure centers invariably group children by age; open structure centers sometimes mix 2½ to 5 year old children. Family day care homes commonly have infants, toddlers, and children who come home from school. Instances of care and attention to infants were common in family care, non-existent in group care.

The number of people in a setting also varied. Although we tried to get a range of settings according to size, all of our closed structure settings were large centers (over 60) and we found no small centers (under 30) with closed structure. Of course home settings are markedly smaller. We seldom found more than four children at one time. In the home-school sample children often were the only child in the home, invariably had their own room, and could choose from only two alternatives, spend time with mother, or spend time by self.

Assets and Liabilities

The data which have been presented would appear to shed some light on the possibilities which several types of day care offer for experiences considered to promote sound development during the preschool years. Each type appears to offer certain kinds of experience more easily than others.

Closed structure day care This setting characteristically offers high adult input so that a child can feel fairly certain of adult attention. It presents clear adult authority and offers children who are not afraid of adult sanctions an opportunity to test social limits. (Limit-testing of skills, especially physical skills, rarely is allowed.) Adults do not respond to children in an individualized way. This lack may damage self-esteem [illegible] children who feel that their wishes are always disregarded or it may make children overly timid about asserting their ideas or opinions.

This type of program also has relatively high cognitive input, as defined by opportunities for small muscle, closed structure activities designed to teach perceptual skills and master eye-hand coordination. Closed structure activities can offer opportunities for a sense of achievement and competence lacking in open activities. A puzzle presents specific constraints and when they have been met there is a clear and rewarding end. Dough and swinging do not offer this sense of mastery and completion. Other cultural conventions such as colors, shapes, positional prepositions also are taught. Since these are characteristically presented as a group activity, they are not tied into a child's immediate experience. Inevitably some children do not understand what they are doing, and may emerge confused about the task and doubtful of their competence. Broad concepts or creative problem solving seldom are offered as cognitive tasks. Social skills usually are taught by adults as rules and manners although a child can learn much about peer relationships. The large amount of time spent in structured transitions often provides unplanned opportunities for peer interchange.

Sensory stimulation is notably lacking in this type of program. Adults rarely hold or hug children, and paint, clay and other sensuous materials characteristically are absent. Environmental responsiveness in the form of sand, pillows, swings and cuddly toys usually is lacking.

Open structure day care This setting offers considerable freedom to explore, to initiate, to be mobile and to experience the world through sensory channels. Open structure centers provide much less predictable adult input. If the relatively low input is not exceedingly individualized, children may turn to their peers for help, attention and social imitation. Such behavior might restrict both present and future opportunities to learn from adults.

This setting characteristically offers excellent opportunities to develop social skills with peers. The weakness in such a program lies in the danger that the adults may not have sufficient impact on the environment either through their ability to individualize, label and clarify or through their ability to introduce complexity into the physical environment. Although this environment offers many of the exploratory opportunities necessary for cognitive growth, the teacher may not capitalize on them, keeping the program at a low level of complexity.

Another problem in this setting is that children's needs pile up at certain times of the day such as lunch and before and after naptime. In closed structure centers children soon learn that the teacher expects them to manage independently, but in many open structure settings teachers would like to meet individual needs and children are still hopeful that they might. It is hard for a teacher to spread herself so far. Even though extra help is provided at such times, many children want attention from their own teacher.

Family day care homes Homes appear to offer most of the components essential to individualized care: flexibility, high adult initiation, opportunities for sensory input, and creative exploring. These ingredients appear especially ideal for infants and toddlers. Opportunities for peer interaction are somewhat unpredictable depending on the grouping in any given home. Preschool children may not have available playmates to develop optimum complexity in spontaneous play. However, long periods of rich, uninterrupted play are possible, permitting children to test the limits of their play ideas and to reach the saturation point without interruption.

The high percentage of activities with much mobility combined with the low percentage of closed activities may indicate a lack of materials which require small muscle skills, eye-hand coordination. As in open structure settings the adult may miss opportunities to move the child toward greater complexity. However, we have found a great deal of conversation and talking about things in homes. Much of the recorded adult input occurred during long adult-child conversations about people and events.

After years of observing in group care programs, our first observations in homes produced a kind of culture shock. Conversations were not formal discussions of "what little rabbit did" but about whether the photograph on the bureau was taken before or after the family day care mother was married, and if John (her son) was born then, or whether "the post office where my daddy works is the same one where the mail man gets his mail".

There is also considerable teaching about younger children. I observed a long activity segment of a 4 year old playing with a 13 month old toddler while the family day care mother was sitting in a nearby armchair sewing. She kept monitoring the play and explaining to the 4 year old what was happening.

> "He can't throw it to you - he doesn't know where it will go when he does that."
>
> "When you help him up like that you choke him. Look where your hands are. Let him get up by himself; that is the best help."

This kind of conversation went on and on. I finally labeled the activity segment "Practicum and Seminar in managing Tommy". Homes offer a slice of the real world and do not have the feeling of artificiality common to many group programs.

Family day care has been criticized for the absence of an educational component. In our data, the higher percentage in the category of much mobility may be indicative of some potential shortcomings. In the "good home" group, parents and teachers continually offered interesting activities which were selected by the child and involved an attentive, sitting-still, small muscle orientation. Most family day care homes offer vastly more opportunities than group programs to comprehend the adult world and its functioning, but some are lacking in presentation of "stuff" and encouragement to use it. Paper, pencils and crayons, paste, scissors may never be offered. Yet most kindergartens assume considerable previous experience with these materials.

Home-school combination With few exceptions our data have fallen on a continuum from "closed structure centers" at one end to "home-school combination" at the other. This home-school group offers the maximum in a child-centered orientation. At school these children are assured of rich opportunities for peer interaction in an environment rich in things and people (adult-child ratio is 1:6). The home setting characteristically provides two ingredients: the privacy of the child's room, again rich in things, and access to an adult who expects to spend some time in a one-to-one tutoring relationship. These mothers are skillful teachers, continually looping the child's perceptions and observations into more complex relationships.

This kind of attention is possible, as we see it, partly because there are not large numbers of other children in the setting. Many teachers in group settings who do not behave in this way have done this kind of teaching at home with their own children, but cannot do it in a larger setting given the constraints of scheduling and group management.

Family Day Care as a Community Service

Reports from a variety of day care projects have commented on the warm and responsible care found in family day care homes (Chapman and Lazar, 1971). The mothers whom we observed certainly fitted this description. They clearly liked children and enjoyed interacting with them.

The data presented here also indicate that homes, as compared to full day group programs, offer a more flexible environment which includes higher adult responsiveness and much opportunity for exploration and for choice-making. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that family day care offers many of the experiences which are considered essential to growth in the early years.

The Educational Component

Family day care is criticized for its lack of an educationl component. Certainly this component takes a different form in family day care homes than in group programs. Educational opportunities in homes develop naturally around two kinds of experiences. One is the chance to explore, through all sensory channels, the world of immediate experience. The second is the opportunity to observe and talk about the real world and how it works. Although adults differ in their ability to make these experiences maximally useful to children, homes, by their nature, do provide rich educational experiences.

Homes do not always offer a sufficiently well-rounded experience to provide children with all the skills and knowledge of others' expectation that might be useful as they move into the broader community. As children approach school age some experience with more complex settings probably is useful in building solid bridges between home and school.

Contacts with the outside world also help care-givers to gain a more objective view of their home and its experience vis-a-vis the broader life of the community. Nursery schools such as cooperatives and Head Start have served this function, offering a program both for children and adults. The informal, neighborhood-based nursery school has much to offer as a supplement to the home. It is important that it be accessible both physically and psychologically. Rigidity of expectations concerning hours and attendance and formal teacher-oriented curriculum models all tend to exclude the care-giver from participation in the setting.

Certainly family day care or any form of home care should not be expected to carry the entire burden of education without the help of supportive services. These services are available in abundance to the families of children reported here as the home-school combination. Some homes in our family day care sample also have children in nursery school or Head Start part of the day, and our limited evidence suggests that the combination is a fruitful one. 5/

Lack of Visibility

The family day care network, as it now exists, is not sufficiently visible to potential users. Mothers who find good family day care arrangements often report that they stumbled into them through word-of-mouth or ads on supermarket bulletin boards. 6/ Family day care would be

---

5/ June Sale (1971) describes a variety of ways in which community resources have been made more accessible to mothers in her project.

6/ Both the Pasadena and the Portland Family Day Care Projects have provided much useful data about this network and ways in which it might be tapped. (Sale, 1971; Emlen, 1971; Collins, 1969).

much more useful community service if its services could be made more accessible to users.

In addition, if the service were more visible and received recognition in the community as an important component of community life, women might be more willing to declare officially that they are, indeed, care-givers. This step would then permit more sensible planning of supportive community services.

Family Day Care as an Indicator of Neighborhood Quality

Family day care appears to be an especially suitable form of care, in communities where population density is relatively low and single family housing units, rather than apartments, are common. In every home where we observed, outdoor play space was ample and easily accessible. In communities where this is not the case, family day care may offer more limited usefulness. Willner (as reported in Emlen, 1970) commented on the physical inadequacies of the home environments in the New York Family Day Care Project. However, in those communities, a major problem across the entire childhood age-range often is that the neighborhood does not provide a good child-rearing environment for any of its families. And, until this problem is tackled, even the best group care option will fail to meet family needs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abt Associates Inc. A Study in Child Care, 1970-71. 5 vols. Report for the Office of Economic Opportunity, Office of Program Development, Evaluation Branch, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates Inc., 1971.

Barker, Roger G. "On the Nature of the Environment." Journal of Social Issues, XIX, No. 4, 1963.

Chapman, Judith and Lazar, Joyce. "A Review of the Present Status and Future Needs in Day Care Research." Washington, D.C.: Prepared for Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development. 1971.

Collins, Alice H. and Watson, Eunice L. The Day Care Neighborhood Service: A Handbook for the Organization and Operation of a New Approach to Family Day Care. Portland, Oregon: Tri-County Community Council, 1969.

Emlen, Arthur. Matchmaking in Neighborhood Day Care. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, 1971.

_________. "Realistic Planning for the Day Care Consumer." Social Work Practice. New York: Columbia University, 1970.

Low, Seth and Spindler, Pearl. Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States. Children's Bureau, Publication No. 46-1968. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Prescott, Elizabeth. Children in Group Day Care: The Effect of a Dual Child-Rearing Environment. Los Angeles : Research Department, Welfare Planning Council, Los Angeles Region (mimeo), 1964.

Prescott, Elizabeth and Jones, Elizabeth. "Day Care for Children: Assets and Liabilities." Children, March-April, 1971.

_________. Group Day Care as a Child-Rearing Environment. Final report for Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Pasadena, Calif.: Pacific Oaks College, 1967.

Rowe, Mary P. Economics of Child Care. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates Inc., 1971.

Ruderman, F.A. "Day Care: A Challenge to Social Work." Child Welfare, XVIII, March, 1964.

Sale, June. "I'm Not Just a Babysitter." Report on Community Family Day Care Service for the Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Pasadena, Calif.: Pacific Oaks College, 1971.

Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Westat Research Inc. Day Care Survey, 1970: Summary Report and Basic Analysis. Report prepared for Office of Economic Opportunity, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1971.

White House Conference on Children. Profiles of Children. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

SESSION II

Friday evening's session was entitled Present Realities in All Day Care and was chaired by Elizabeth Prescott. The discussion began with the question of what a day care experience and environment should be for children. Interest centered around infant care (from birth to two years).

Cager: *In relationship to the appropriateness of day care, you are well aware there have been many requests for infant group day care; what do you think about that - in terms of environment in a group situation?*

Peters: *I think this can be done; I think it can be a very profitable and worthwhile experience for the child and the family. But I think it's going to have to be looked at in terms of how you are defining your total program - not just whether or not you're taking infants into a group. Part of the problem, particularly in our present approach to group child care, has been that we peer group children. We put all the same ages together, and this can create real staffing problems; it can create very real interactional problems; it can be very expensive.*

I had experience in a very interesting and worthwhile experimental program at the University of North Carolina in which we accepted infants into day care in a group setting, but we did not call this infant day care. We were using a vertical age group - an age mix - so that we really were setting up extended families, rather than just a bunch of babies in one room, a bunch of toddlers in another and a bunch of 2 year olds in another. This was an expensive program; it had a research component. We were supplying a lot of other services - health care in particular - and studying health experience. I feel very strongly that this kind of program is viable and can be carried out, but it requires a real change in our whole approach to what group day care really is.

It has some of the assets of family day care homes in that children interact with each other. It also prevents some of the problems in some family day care homes in that staff is more visible and the parents are more aware of what's going on. With some families, who are seeking an 'educational component', it can be a very acceptable kind of experience. I don't think that infants should be separated from other children because infants grow up and segregating them in separate groups - on a peer-age grouping - is a very unsatisfactory experience.

But I think we have to look at what we might be able to do in a different setting. That was a special type of program. I don't think it should be the only way to go, but neither do I think it should be completely cast out. I think, as I said earlier today, we are awfully inclined to see only *one goal ahead. In our planning in this country for services for people, we always seem to put all of our eggs into one basket. So I would hope that this kind of approach, which has real meaning to certain groups of parents and has certain protective, supportive implications for some families, should be kept intact.*

Prescott: *I think this is an important thing to keep in mind. In many ways in the group setting you described, you were able to do certain things which many group settings have not proposed; you were able to keep it small; and you were able to build in continuity of staffing; and you were able to build in wide age-grouping. All three of these things do not come easily in a group program.*

The special time and energy necessary for preparing the environment for infants and older children was described by two family day care mothers:

Horvath: *The baby is going to be in a crib until it's three months old and when the smiles begin - that's when you've got to start working with that child; that's when you start showing him things and looking for response; and this is when you've got to be really with it; this is when you start the teaching - or whatever you want to call it; this is when the kids start being human. I think they need 100% of your attention, if you want the child to continue growing - even if you're just holding him by the window and watching the leaves move, or you're making the sunshine move on a plate on the table. You've got to wake him up to sounds.*

Byrd: *It takes more of your individual time with a small infant because with older children you fix things and they can go on and take care of themselves; but with a baby you have to do everything for it. It's time consuming - it's not that the child is a lot of trouble itself - it's that if it gets done for the baby you have to be the one to do it. If there's an infant in your home, you have to stop your schedule at least three times a day to feed him and hold him while you give him his bottle. When it's time to feed him, you have to make sure the other children are busy doing something and take time to feed that baby.*

Further discussion about the advantages for children of a mixture of group and family settings followed. Variables, such as complexity of setting, vertical age grouping, size of groups, continuity of staffing and intensity of relationships, were raised:

Prescott: *I am coming to feel that when children are somewhere around the age of four that they probably need - here I think this varies greatly, depending on children - some kind of increase in the complexity in the social setting. I am coming to feel that for four year olds some kind of contact with a group program is exceedingly useful; and it helps both the child and the adult to look at their home in relation to social demands. They come to see not* *only what is characteristic of the home but what is the broader cultural setting. I think this kind of experience is exceedingly useful before the sort of arbitrary demands of public school.*

Heinicke: *I do believe one could make a very good case for small groupings, with small mixed peer situations, with continuous relationship to the same staff. The first western experiment in that regard was, of course, Anna Freud's "Infants Without Families", which started out with these same little babies in an essentially completely mixed group agewise and in large rooms. (These were the children who were separated from their parents - taken out of London). She found that when she then put them into smaller - what she called family groupings, with one permanent staff and an assistant staff - that there were vast changes in their development. (She was a very good observer of that development.)*

There are more recent studies which again certainly point to this as a very fruitful concept to look at: the cottage concept, the small unit, all your work (Liz Prescott) on size, certainly fit in here. This is a generic concept that holds up in child development studies; the continuity of staffing, the small group, the more intimate relationships.

Of course, we can look at the whole thing again differently from the generic concept. Namely, you really have to look at care or substitute care in relation to a) the nature of the family's development and b) the nature of the child's development itself. That is, what a child needs at three months, six months and twelve months surely varies a great deal; we may have to begin to think in terms of different care arrangements which are ideal for certain developmental needs. For example, from zero to three months we are dealing with physiology; but I am impressed by the data in terms of the first three months (it is a neurophysiological phase), at the amount of the impact of the caretaker - if sufficiently adequate and if the major things are dealt with. It is very different from, say, the three to six months where you are already getting very definite awareness of the caretaker.

The Ainsworth data, for example, shows to me quite convincingly that the impact of the caretaker is already much greater than the variations in care taking. Then you move on to the first year and begin to get the whole beginning of the development of an individual - and still continuity, warmth and limit settings are important. But then the autonomy issue comes. Maybe when the child is three to three and a half, you begin to need some group experience which, perhaps, the family day care center can't always provide. So all I've said is that I think there are certain generic concepts in care taking that hold true for both good group care and good family day care. Then I've said that I think you really have to think not of family versus group day care or in-home care versus some kind of day care, but to think in terms of what is the impact, ultimately, on the child and the developmental phase in which he is.

Class: In '60 I was in London and I was interested in the out-of-home care in respect to delinquency and institutional care of the probation service in the home and foster home. One of the people in the Home Office told me that they had, now, not only a research but an administrative study. They had made a survey of how Borstal Boys turn out. (Borstal is like a forestry camp or a work experience camp for delinquent boys about the age of 14 to 18). Now they had a judging board as to what was success - you and I might or might not agree that this was a good criteria - and one of them was that of not repeating, etc. They found that the Borstals that had the expensive psychiatric service - considerably much higher per capita cost - did not have a high percentage of success. But the Borstals in the rural areas, with practically no psychiatric treatment, had a predominant, disproportionate number of successes; these tended to simulate a foster home situation - namely, that there was very little turn over in the Borstal camp attendants, etc. So what really seemed to be said was that as the Borstal system, which was a group care, approached a simulated foster family situation, they had more success. But it still carried the name of group care.

Prescott: This makes me think of several other findings. One is Wolin's studies of children in institutions in Europe; his conclusion was that in those settings where they could communicate a clear value system, where they did not have a model of pathology, where they had clear responsibilities which they expected children to assume - these seemed to be the differentiating factors between those who are able to go out into the world and accept a vocational choice, and this sort of thing, versus those who can't.

I also remember Maas' study of children in England; these were children who had been removed from a large city out into rural areas, and I find myself thinking about whether there is a common denominator in all of these studies. One that seems to come out is the question of the relationship of the adults to the children and the potency of this relationship. I'm coming to feel that there is some relationship between the number of really personal and potent relationships that you have at a certain age and the clarity of value systems that are communicated to you.

Lazar: I get hung up on some of the nitty gritty problems. I think we would all agree that young children need continuity of care and love. But the average child care worker lasts seven months on the job; the average center worker lasts six months on the job; she makes $400 per month. How can you provide continuity of care under those circumstances?

Peters: I was just thinking about continuity of person - some of Bettye Caldwell's work has raised questions about whether or not any one individual himself is necessary .....

Heinicke: This is exactly why I'm emphasizing what I am because Art

(Emlen) has been very concerned with this basic need for continuity in terms of person to person care, organized in a system. Then the child can develop expectations in relation to what do you do. When you have this kind of professional situation, where the support of the staff is not present, then the staff turnover is such that there can't possibly be continuity. I think this is one of the beauties of this team work here (Pacific Oaks) - that you are giving that kind of care and that kind of continuity; you are saying that this is important and these are the very critical variables; you take them quite out of the value judgment area.

Prescott: *There are centers where the continuity can work very differently; there are centers where the continuity is really carried by the director, who is the potent force throughout the whole center, versus other centers where continuity is abandoned and they say, 'Now for goodness sake don't let the children get attached to any one person because she won't be here that long'.*

The need for alternative types of child care arrangements was a common thread that ran throughout the Conference. Research in group day care is in its toddlerhood and in family day care it is in its infancy. There was a good deal of attention paid to the need for longitudinal studies and research of children in various types of care. It was pointed out that many of the institutional studies had been based on poor care; and what was needed were studies that could affect social policy - studies of good child care settings:

Kresh: *In institutional settings the data has shown detrimental effects where the settings are depersonalized, where there's been no interaction, no verbalization of children, no socialization. But the data has been based upon what a bad institutional setting has been; the data is inconclusive in terms of, say, a good institutional setting. My caution is that we should be careful about deciding about the family situation versus the center situation. We're not ready to make those decisions yet.*

Peters: *Well, my question to you is, 'Are we going to wait and wait for another twenty years before we get a whole lot more data'?*

Nye: *I'd like to see various forms of child care have their day. I'm not sure in the long run that any one would entirely dominate. One of the interesting things I've done in reacting to some of the papers (of the conferees) is to conclude that one of these day care arrangements is better for one type of kid that can live in a big day care center, with lots of complications and lots of stimulation; and that another type of kid is much better off in some kind of a family situation. But. anyway, to put it all together, I would hate to see any one program that would be entirely supported and the others entirely washed out.*

Emlen: *I think I would go a step further and say that it's really in some sense not entirely up to us to say which should be promoted. In fact one or another alternative is being* promoted by the day care consumer; and it's up to us to accept, to a certain extent, the facts of life with regard to the choices that are being made and to devise ways - even if it involves reconstituting the family situation and group care center for children - to go about seeing that it is done well. If the choice is made for the family day care situation, then bring to that the supportive services necessary to strengthen that. If a policy is going to be general that way, I really think it's sort of academic to say that one is better. It's different, anyway; it has different consequences; but I don't know if it's better.

Kresh: Let me be the devil's advocate. I guess my point really is related to what you said about how many years longer before we know - considering the number of years that research has gone on. It's serious, and my discomfort with all that's gone on and how little we still know about the whole area - we've really got to come to terms with policy. We come back to 'Let's give people some freedom of choice'. But policy should also be on the basis of research, made on what the consequences of those kinds of experiences are that we still do not know the answers to, and a number of other issues. After all these years of research, where are we? It bothers me to some extent. Here we are faced with policy issues of day care and we know damn well that if it's not today, then tomorrow or very soon, policy is going to be determined.

Sure, it's good to give people choices - some alternatives - but, really, not having any answer to what the consequences of any of these alternatives are, because our research is still so ambiguous about what the consequences of those things are, is a little scarey in a way.

Lipsett: What scares me is what is happening when we talk about Federal policy, as it is coming out of HR 1. It's not really what's good for children - regardless of what research is - it's how do we get mothers off of welfare.....

Heinicke: I think that there is also an issue that we would have to be clear about here. It is very important to recognize the consumer control and to give the freedom of choice; but at some level, too, when you ask the policy question, you do have to have some standards that go beyond what the consumer wants.

You have to be in a position to guide the choice making, so then you come back to: What would I do if I were asked to make the guidelines? I would agree that a lot more research has to be done; but I do think that from what I've been hearing from this group, I would go back and I would try to document (you could even do it in a research paper, if necessary) the importance of what we are saying.

Take the nature of a stable relationship opportunity - I think there's a lot of evidence to indicate that this is good for the child's development. I would then put in Baumrind's work, which I think is impressive, in terms of other facets *of child care that are very important. Limit setting, etc. - I would say that one could begin to expand the notion of size as one of the corollaries of giving this intimate, continuing relationship. I think if I look for a moment, if I may, at clinical studies of effectiveness of treatment and if I look at the whole schmeer of all the different therapies, the one thing that impresses me is the intensity of the relationship, the continuity of relationship, a commitment of the helper that is continuous.*

When I look at that and sense a little bit of what is going on in your Project right here, I would say what is very important in the Family Day Care Project is the administrative support that it's getting - the kind of feeling of importance that is being communicated to the family day care mothers, who then give a commitment of a different quality than of a woman who cannot feel good about herself. These, I think, are the important items.

The empirical findings, dealing with the bridges necessary for the transition from early childhood settings to the primary school, were shared by the participants:

Horvath: *I'm not an expert - I can just say what I've seen happening. The group center child gives school less problems because the group situation is not a novelty to him. Since the center is trying to give them freedom, which I think is right, it helps enable the small kids to know now to handle their freedom within the classroom situation. I may be kind of square, but I think school is something very serious. The kids should have fun, they should love to go; but I think school is school and home is home and I think the kids that are in the day care center do not have this sort of big difference. They don't live it so much. Their home is for sleeping and to be there Saturday and Sunday; but the rest of the time they're in school, whether you call it a center or not. Particularly in the lower grades, where the activities, the tools and the physical setting - like tables, chairs, and the toilets .....*

Prescott: *Interestingly, this has been the report that has come in over the years from teachers who have not liked Headstart and Children's Centers; they say the kids come into kindergarten and they don't have respect for what 'I'm going to teach them'. Now this could have several interpretations. One could be that for children who have been in homes that kindergarten is a well-defined experience because it's different from what a home environment is like and it communicates exactly what you said.*

Another interpretation could be that if you have been in a group program, kindergarten is somewhat obsolete and ought to be designed differently. I'm not sure which is accurate, except I have talked to a number of kindergarten teachers who have reflected your point of view; so I think there must be something to it.

Horvath: *In school there are going to be open classes now - more and more - and making the classroom setting more and more informal. They are making that setting more and more like that the children have in the centers. For a child of five, the person in the center is the mother figure and the teacher in the classroom is a mother figure. They don't really get to appreciate the difference very much and what I've found, particularly in the Follow-Through programs, is the difficulty that the center children have with the sitting down experience - like the teacher encourages everybody to sit down and we're going to talk about George Washington. These children consider these periods a bore because they get too many of them in their daily experience.*

I don't think any day care mother or any mother in her home is going to get hold of her kids and say, sit down and wait until all the other members of the household are sitting down - except maybe at dinner. (Laughter) It's not really that funny; they've got to sit down and shut up for this; they've got to sit down and shut up for lunch; they've got to sit down and shut up for story time; and if they don't want to have it, they still have to.

Heinicke: *You're now hitting on my real, central research interest and that is what I've called - what makes a child sit down and attend and comprehend and take in; and I'm moving away from just sitting down - and we've called it 'task orientation'. The child encompasses a number of different personality qualities that, indeed, allow the child in kindergarten and first grade to sit - but to sit not because somebody's told him to, but because he wants to sit there; and he can sit there and he can take in and enjoy and learn. We are trying, indeed, to look at the kinds of child care experiences that have led to the engaged and motivated sitting down and learning .....*

This led to a discussion of what do we want our children to be like as adults. Everyone agreed that all children should learn to read, and have the option and ability to read; but there was not consensus on the how, when or what of reading:

Nye: *The reason we haven't come to the kind of answers that you want is that these answers involve value judgments ..... In other words, if you want a kid that has maximum intellectual capabilities, then you go one way; if you want one who is likely to have a secure personality structure and not break up into pieces, and so on, maybe you go another way. And I think, in general, we get some kind of consensus on what we don't want in society. But for a generation we tried to say what good mental health is; when you get on the positive end, then you can go off on these kinds of directions; there's a good thing over here - a good thing over there - and a good thing over there.*

Now I, personally, think that as researchers we shouldn't start saying which one of those sets of positive criteria is the best set and if we do well, the politician will buy it okay; but I think we will sell out our research competence when we start making these value judgments. We can do this sort of thing in terms of consequences, as you've done in your paper (Prescott). Describing what happens in this kind of day care center and what happens in that kind of day care center, and so on, is legitimate; but I think when we say 'we like this happening', 'we don't like that happening', 'that was important' - 'this happening should happen and that shouldn't happen' - then I think we're clear off base. I don't think we're ever going to be able to come to Congress and say, 'do this because we made a value judgment in that'; and I don't know who is going to make those, but I don't believe it's up to the researcher to do it.

Kresh: I disagree with you there - I disagree with you on a statement you made where we try to dichotomize intellectual competence versus good self concepts kind of variables; I don't think the two are really separable. Someone said, 'Why is it important for someone to sit there and read books?' and we often get into value judgments like - we're going to instill in the child a love of reading. Frankly, I don't give a damn whether a kid loves to read or not. What I do give a damn about it giving a person the most personal freedom he can have with options ..... My option is not that he loves to read but if he can read he certainly has a lot of choices in his life that he doesn't have if he can't read.

Nye: I'd say, if you can't read that's a bad thing. But what you want to read or whether you want to read, is in this positive realm; and then somebody thinks reading is the greatest thing and somebody else couldn't care less; but I think we all agree that not to be able to read is a bad thing. I think we can agree on the negative aspect, but not on the positive.

Kresh: I really feel that tied in with one's self concept that there's, somehow, a cognitive set which happens in school; and kids know whether they're doing well or not cognitively. It's very much tied in with their self image and it's not really separable.

Lazar: There are a number of different kinds of schools and the value systems in the total school are set by the peer group, rather than the faculty. Some schools have an intellectual goal; some schools have an athletic goal; some schools have possession and status goals. It all depends on what kind of a school the student is in and how he will value himself and how he will develop his self concept. If the kid is doing poorly academically and he's in a school that values academic achievement, then he won't have a good self concept. But if he had great academic achievement and happens to be in a school where athletics is the big thing, and he's puny, then he won't have a good self concept either.

> *You know one of the things that we don't look at is the peer group and what kind of a culture they have established.*

Kresh: *But when you say that, Joyce, I think you're talking about a child who is typically beyond the primary grades. I spent ten years teaching primary grades and I'm here to tell you that the teacher's perception of what that kid is like and his value of what that child is like very much influences what his peer group will think about him. It's very evident, always.*

The evening's discussion ended with consensus when we again tried to pinpoint the key variables in quality child care. This was summarized by Chris Heinicke:

> *The key variable, it seems to me, that affects the child in relation to these values, is a feeling of what we call warmth - affection - a sense of being given to; that the world is worthwhile because someone really cares - in 'corny' language. This is the critical variable and you don't have to make value judgments about it. All the research seems to me to point to the importance of the child having the experience from someone that he is cared about, cared for; and this is what makes him receptive to the communication. A trememdous amount of research points to this.*
>
> *If you look at depressed people - if you look at the commitments of copping out - I hear too often 'Does someone care about me?'; 'Is is worth going on?'; 'Why bother?' These things, I think, are central on a purely empirical level to what makes the child respond; and this is the first thing I would look at, in terms of the value of any day care program.*

SESSION III

THE PUBLIC REGULATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE: AN INNOVATIVE PROPOSAL

Prepared for
"Family Day Care West - A Working Conference"
to be held at
Pacific Oaks College
Pasadena, California
February 18-19, 1972

Norris E. Class, Ph.D.
Professor of Social Work
University of Southern California

THE PUBLIC REGULATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE: AN INNOVATIVE PROPOSAL

by
Norris E. Class
Professor of Social Work

University of Southern California

The position of this paper is that the public regulation of family day care by means of licensing is a questionable community approach to safeguarding the services and upgrading the quality of care. It is, therefore, contended that alternative regulatory approaches should be considered. An alternative approach in the form of a registration-inspection is proposed and speculative gains are considered. However, it is immediately granted that these gains will not be forthcoming unless structural aspects of the service are properly dealt with especially that of administrative location. Finally, it is emphasized that this proposed approach of registration-inspection is only one part of a community regulatory system to safeguard and upgrade family day care.

I

The standard tests of an administrative operation are (i) effectiveness, (ii) efficiency, and (iii) economy. Applying any or all of these tests, family day care licensing receives a very low score--rating.

The lack of community or social visibility of family day care, say, in contrast to group day care, increases the difficulties of achieving comprehensiveness of implementation. Thus, there is a lower effectiveness of the licensing law as a safeguarding measure for the total community.

The ease and rapidity with which family day care arrangements come about create problems as to efficient licensing administration. Traditionally, the goal of any child care licensing program is to deal with the situation before the child is in the facility. The whole licensing process is a premise upon this assumption. Yet, empirically, we know that much day care is never licensed and much which is licensed is licensed only after the fact of initial operation. The task of licensing a person "presently in business" is a very different task than dealing with the person before operations have started. This mixing of licensure before and after the fact is bound to lower the efficiency of staff operations as well as being conducive to the creation of a poor image in the community.

Thirdly, and perhaps the most important determinate in proposing a departure from a licensing approach to family day care is the cost factor--economy. Licensing is not only cumbersome and frequently a delayful operation but it is costly, especially so in light of the safeguards achieved. Thus, it is one thing for the state to develop at considerable expense a structure and operation for safeguarding by means of licensing a limited number of group day care facilities each serving a sizable number of children, but it is really something else to apply this elaborate process to almost a countless number of small size units of child care which may be of short duration and which the user, i.e., the parent, is in a position to "check" on the service daily and to deal immediately with what may be regarded as improper or detrimental care.

In addition to the questionableness of using a licensing approach in family day care, when tested by the triad of effectiveness, efficiency and economy, there is the overall question of cultural-legal appropriateness of using this type of a regulatory instrument for family day care. Licensing is a highly formal investigational operation to reduce hazards especially of a technical nature. On the other hand, family day care is characterized by informality of operation and must, in the final analysis, be appraised in a subjective manner. In professional licensing, such as medicine, the state endeavors to insure the presence of a technical competence before the person starts to practice, which is assumed to be a life-time proposition. In family day care the opposite is true. The user seeks a highly personalized service which may be--to be sure--improved by certain testing and learning but, hopefully, a service that is not technicalized nor bureaucraticized the way large group day care must be. To use licensing as a means of safeguarding and improving quality of this type of service is analgous to calling in a commercial mover to rearrange the furniture of a home.

II

In light of this finding of questionable appropriateness of licensing as a form of public regulation of family day care, the following is proposed: namely, what might be best termed at this point of discussion a registration-inspection approach.

The registration-inspection approach would operate in this fashion: any adult person providing family day care to one or a small number of children would be required to register the fact of operation and to report the names of children being so cared for. The locale of registration would be the office providing the inspection--and hopefully, this office would also be responsible for providing other services relating to child development.

Upon the receipt of a statement of intent to provide a limited amount of family day care, such a person would be supplied a copy of state standards of family day care and other literature relating to family day care. In finalizing the registration, the provider or would-be provider would have to "sign" that she had read the standards and that she would meet or would endeavor to meet these standards immediately. The registrant would also sign that she was aware that reasonable inspection of her home and care would take place including the right to contact the adult users of the service. The registrant would be required to give users a copy of state standards of care which would also carry information as to the manner and place of reporting complaints in respect to alleged failure to meet standards specifically or detrimental care generally. In addition, the registrant would be notified of possible negative sanctions applicable by the state if she continued to provide service as a sustained finding of non-conformity and/or detrimental care.

With registration and report of providing care, an inspection would be made by what might be best termed a child care "visitor". The function of this visit would be to determine substantial conformity to state standards and to help the registrant in overcoming deficiencies in respect to standards. The child care visitor would be expected to offer consultation or suggest teaching and learning resources in relation to problem child development generally and out-of-home care specifically. In fact, one of the important aims of the child care visitation service would be to get the registrants of care involved in community education programs both as teachers as well as learners.

Although there is no finalized position as yet, it is tentatively proposed that in most instances there would be no collateral investigations or inspectional activity by the traditional fire marshall or public health office. However, there would be an administrative expectation that the child care visitor (and supervisorial personnel) would be trained through staff development to appraise generally and practically the life safety aspects of the care situation. There would also be an administrative expectation that where there was, in the opinion of the visitor, uncertainty or the registrant challenged the visitor's judgment as to not meeting life safety standards, the worker would have access to expert consultation service in these two areas. This expertness might be available in the form of a life safety specialist of the regulatory agency--who would also assist in training--or it might be procured from the public agency having these activities as primary functions or it might possibly be obtained from commercial consultative services operating in these areas.

The role of a child care visitor, it seems important to note, would not carry any major responsibility for the implementation of negative sanction arising from nonconformity to standards specifically or providing detrimental care generally. This function, which is primarily a law enforcement operation, would tend to be carried by the supervisorial personnel and/or specialized staff well oriented to regulatory fair hearing procedures and court actions. However, there would be an administrative expectation that the child care visitors would be given training in relation to being qualified as expert witness and in effective participation in hearing situations.

III

The possible advantage from a registration inspection approach to family day care might be five-fold:

1. This approach would contribute to self-definition of role taking. The act of registration would amount to the making of a public announcement of assuming the role of family day care procedure.

From time in memorial human societies have used the public announcement as a means of setting up patterns of expected behavior--witness for example the posting of marriage bans in the church.

2. This approach *moves the regulatory investigation of inspection from the abstract to the concrete.* A fundamental regulatory criticism of licensing family day care is that the investigation should be done in advance of the placement of the child and, therefore, remains at an abstract level of discussion. For a child care licensing person to say that this home is generally o.k. does not provide for much comfort to the child for which the care is specifically inappropriate.

3. A third possible gain is that *this approach, if properly implemented, could facilitate parent or user participation in the safeguarding operation.* Traditionally and empirically licensing tends to be a relationship between the state and the provider of the service: it is a dyad rather than a triad of the state, the provider and the user. In licensing the state, as it were, theoretically takes on almost full responsibility for the protection of the child--relieving the parent almost completely of this task. Of course, it in no way is it possible for the licensing agency to provide this full protection. Perhaps this myth of full protection by the state results from an "over-sell" of the value of the licensing investigation. In the proposal at hand, the parent or the user selects the provider of the service and must, therefore, approach the situation with a *caveat emptor* frame of mind. Moreover, the provider of the service must supply the user with the agreed upon standards of care and

procedure for lodging possible complaint. Anyone familiar with the licensing of foster family care will probably attest to the fact that many parents or users are, in a sense, intimidated against criticizing the care by the foster parent's frequently expressed statement, "You know I am licensed by the state" which translates into "anything I do is okay".

4. A possible fourth gain, and somewhat reverse from the last one, is that many persons provide good family day care operation without a license and other potentially good family day care providers do not apply, both for the same reason: they are unnecessarily fearful about their qualifications. Possibly a simple theorem of licensure application might be: the greater the sensitivity of the persons, the greater the feeling that they would not "qualify" for the license. Yet, the person reluctant to seek a license might be much more confident in respect to having her home examined in relation to children that have been placed there by their own parents who have a common law, constitutional and statutory right to do this. (Parenthetically, it might be noted that the state intervention is premised on the fact that the foster parent does not have the same legal rights to receive the child as the parent has to place his there.

5. A fifth and final gain is that registration-inspection would bring the family day care problem into a beginning regulatory order which is not present now. This should definitely facilitate community planning. The presence of systematic registration of children under care would make possible epidemiological research which should benefit sound day care planning development and coordination. Moreover,

this research might make an important contribution to "de-politicking" day care although this might be too much to expect in an era of the "fast contract". Providing the presence of community education for child development and foster parent program, the child care visitor could play an important role in linking both family day care parent and natural parent with these resources.

IV

It is said that structure is programmed destiny. Certainly the operational gains as listed above will come only if there is proper structuring of the program. An especially important structural aspect is the administrative location of this regulatory service. Elsewhere, I have discussed this matter of "where to put it", departmentally speaking. Not to repeat but only to summarize very briefly that discussion: the position was taken that this program of registration- inspection should be assigned for implementation to the public welfare department as long as that organization has as its primary function the administration of public assistance and other income security programs. When state public welfare departments no longer administer income security programs, then it would seem that the family and/or child welfare devision might be an appropriate location. State departments of public education are not a "good bet" in light of the history of the failure of these departments to deal properly with the regulatory aspects of the private school and the military prep school. A dynamic maternal and child health welfare division of a state public health department merits consideration.

Perhaps, now is the time to seriously consider the setting up of state independent offices of child development. Among other assignments to this new office of child development would be this registration-inspection service. If certain other functions such as the development and conducting of community education programs relative to child development, then the registration-inspection activity would certainly seem to be a "natural affiliate--a proper test for organizational inclusion. .

V

A final note as to the limitation of this registration-inspection needs to be made. At best it constitutes only a beginning phase or one part of public regulation of family day care. Well implemented, it would provide a minimal protective or safeguarding service. Its primary function is to prevent non-detrimental care and only incidentally would it be standard raising in effect. This latter operation of standard raising is important, too, not only for children under care but also for vocational satisfaction of the provider of the service. However, the operational achievement of standard raising will--in the opinion of the writer--be more likely to take place under programs of community accreditation preferably under private or voluntary auspices. Such a community regulatory programs of standard setting and approving of individual situations might be developed by the registered providers of care, users and/or community interested persons or a combination of these categories of persons. Such an association, hopefully state wide, is in a more strategic position to pipeline into operations what advancement, refinement and expertise has taken place within the field because the person seeks the accreditation voluntarily: she does not have to have it in order to operate legally. The motivation for accreditation will generally be mixed but hopefully will include a desire for self-improvement as well as prestige and economic aspects. This accreditation should not be seen as something apart from registration-inspection but as both supplementary and complementary to it. The two together--registration-inspection and accreditation--consitutes the two major parts of a community regulatory system. One does not displace the need for the other. Each would reinforce the operational effectiveness of the other. This is where we started and perhaps a good place to stop.

PROBLEMS AND ALTERNATIVES
RELATED TO PROVISION
OF
FAMILY DAY CARE SERVICES

Gloria B. Sparks, ACSW
Program Director
Specialized Children's Services
Los Angeles County Department of
Public Social Services

Report for Pacific Oakes Conference on Family Day Care

By Gloria B. Sparks, ACSW
Specialized Children's Services
Los Angeles County Department of
Public Social Services

For sometime a considerable amount of publicity has been centered around the government's recognition of the intense need for expansion of child care resources, particularly for low-income families and the environmentally or emotionally deprived child. Enormous sums of money have been allocated to meet this need. To the general public, this is most impressive. To those of us professionally involved in the reality of meeting the child care needs of the public, our task is one of deep frustration.

One of the major reasons for this predicament is that the legislature tends to limit its allocation of day care funds to the expansion and research of child care centers, a day care source that services only 10 percent of the population who use or will need child care. Virtually ignored are the other child care resources actually used by 90 percent of the population, i.e., relative care, in-home care and licensed and unlicensed family day care. It is unrealistic to assume that the expansion of child care centers will decrease or eliminate major dependence on these other child care resources. No single form of child care can possibly meet the complex and varied child care needs of the total population.

The development and expansion of child care centers certainly answers the problem of child care for a number of families. However, it does not respond to the needs of the parent needing child care for a child under age 3, the minimum age set by Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements and the California State Department of Social Welfare Nursery School Licensing Regulations. What happens to those infants

(continued on next page)

and toddlers or to the child who cannot cope with a group setting or the child whose parent works irregular hours. Most nurseries and centers rigidly adhere to hours that accommodate normal working hours. For these children the family day care home has been the only child care resource available to parents who could not qualify for center care or who had no available relative and were unable to afford to pay the high cost of in-home child care.

Today, 20 percent of the population rely on family day care to meet their child care needs because of its convenience and flexibility due to the cooperative attitude of most of the women providing family day care in the setting of their own homes to children of all ages. While family day care is a major resource for the child under age 3, it is also a means of providing the school age child with the experience of after-school family life or "going home" that he could not find in an extended day care center setting.

Although, the law requires a person to be licensed to provide family day care to unrelated children, many family day care arrangements are made in unlicensed homes. Licensed or unlicensed, the women who provide family day care are representative of the universe, socially, economically and in terms of their educational backgrounds. The majority however, have in common that they find their gratification within the home and in caring for children, often fulfilling the emptiness left by the emancipation of their own children. Few view their efforts as a means of monetary gain or as a business adventure.

In November, there were 3,846 licensed family day care homes in Los Angeles County; however, only a small percentage of those licensed are located in the target areas where low income families reside. Thus the need continues to exist to increase this child care resource within the neighborhoods where low income families are struggling to improve the living standards of their families either through training

(continued on next page)

or low paying employment. Despite this fact, Federal Interagency Requirements for Day Care require that an AFDC mother in training must use licensed day care to receive child care funds, on the other hand, a working AFDC mother is not restricted in her choice of child care arrangement to licensed care.

A family day care home must meet the Federal as well as the State requirements, or federal funds for child care funds cannot be utilized. Funds that make it possible for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children unwed mother completing high school or in training to pay for her child care resource. Yet there continues to be a lack of funds allocated either for development of family day care resources, research on family day care or to meet the rigid although unclear educational requirements demanded by the Federal Interagency Requirements for Day Care.

The introduction of the Feieral Interagency Requirements for Day Care and the revisions in State Department of Social Welfare regualtions, under which family day care homes are licensed are in practice extremely restrictive and definite deterrents to the recruitment of additional family day care homes as well as the retention of those currently in existence. The Family Day Care Program has been particularly effected by the new regulations in that they tend to seek to transform the family day care homes into small centers or group settings where the primary concern is centered around the educational component, completely unmindful of the educational and developmental resources already existent in the family day care home. The entire concept of "the family setting" for which the family day care home was designed is gradually being eliminated.

The consequence has been that many family day care resources that had previously been available to children of Aid to Families with Dependent Children families have had to be excluded; that licensed day care parents not only feel that too much is being demanded of them to qualify to accept children of Aid to Families

(continued on next page)

with Dependent Children, but to even question retaining their licenses if they must become like small business operations instead of continuing to share their homes and families in a relaxed family fashion with children whose parents must be away from them for a part of the day.

The problems encountered in the operation of a family day care program are by no means restricted to those day care parents providing family day care to Aid to Families with Dependent Children nor did they begin with the enactment of Federal Interagency Requirement for Day Care. Although licensed family day care has played a unique role in the total scheme of child care for years and has been selected as a child care arrangement by 20% of the population because of its flexibility. It has been and continues to be an unrecognized, highly unappreciated child care resource by the legislature and the many professional people including those persons primarily concerned with the development and the provision of quality child care.

Currently, Day Care still continues to be written under full time foster care regulations; therefore legislation written for full time (24 hours) protection of children in foster care blankets in children in day care without regard for the many differences in the program. The regulations make no exception for proven experience, individual skill or special training the day care mother may already possess or may have had the initiative to attain. Family day care deserves full recognition of its distinct and unique existence as a child care operation and practical, realistic standards that will not only encourage more persons to become licensed for day care but will also enable professional staff to develop family day care services to its full potential.

(continued on next page)

Report for Pacific Oakes Conference on Family Day Care (continued)

Regulation of family day care homes is essential for the basic protection of the children using this type of child care. However, the current licensing procedures discourage many potential day care parents and serve to provide the major protection of licensing, i.e., T.B. clearance and physically safe housing, only to those few who submit to the licensing process thus leaving a large majority of children receiving family day care in unlicensed homes, unprotected. Therefore, to reach this group of "underground" family day care parents and thus truly strengthen and universalize quality family day care, many changes and innovations are needed.

As an alternative to the present licensing process, agency regulation of approval of family day care homes should be limited to a simplified certification process whereby a person may become certified to provide child care in her own home by submitting an affidavit of desire including a willingness to accept agency supervision and to avail herself of orientation and in-service training provided by the agency and to respect the non-discriminatory clause. The affidavit would be accompanied by verification of T.B. clearance and followed by a home visit to verify that the heating is vented and there are no other major safety hazards, i.e., unfenced pool. Annual recertification would be required.

Restrictions regarding age groupings, number of children to be accommodated, income and statement regarding emergency substitute would be eliminated. Fingerprint clearance would only be initiated where a felony has been acknowledged.

To effectively provide and insure quality family day care through certification the burden of responsibility would shift from currently ineffective licensing and renewal procedures to professional supportive services and active parental intervention. To accomplish this, family day care needs should be given equal priority in funding allocations with center child care. Adequate funds should be available through

(continued on next page)

special loans or other means not only for improvement of safety hazards but also for intensive research on family day care.

Organizationally, Family Day Care should be removed from its transitional "step-child" status among the recognized child care programs and given equal but separate status along with Group Day Care and full time (24 hour) Foster Care to fully accommodate its unique origin and structure.

The organization of a Family Day Care Supportive Services Program would entail many facets including adequate staff to perform specific responsibilities:

a) intake or certification of new applicants
b) orientation and in-service training
c) supervision, retention and consultation of certified family day care parents.
d) extensive public (parent) education regarding quality family day care.
e) local and centralized information, referral services and consultation for families in need of child care.

Adequate funds for supportive services staff, public education and training of staff as well as day care parents would be far greater safeguards against abuse in family day care than the present licensing and supervision process. Greater awareness of the general public and parents in particular of what to expect in child care and that certified family day care goes far beyond babysitting will gain public attention and support that licensed family day care has never attained.

As a final note, along with public and legislative recognition, the Schools of Social Work need to take a close look at the limited knowledge of the majority of professional social workers on child care services in general and family day care in particular. There is no doubt that the need for child care services will continue to increase and it should be the responsibility of professional social

(continued on next page)

workers to insure that the provision, selection and utilization of all available child;care resources will serve not only in the total development of the child but to prevent weakening the family structure because of separation and giving needed support and understanding to the part-time natural parent.

GBS:mew
(1-11-72)

SESSION III

Saturday morning the question of regulatory policy was explored. June Sale chaired the meeting and Norris Class led the discussion, based on his paper entitled The Public Regulation of Family Day Care: An Innovative Proposal.

Several areas were covered, including the problems and issues of licensing family day care as it exists today, and the possibilities of using registration and accreditation in the future. While most agreed that licensing, as we know it, presents many difficulties for those who use it, the idea of abandoning it for another system - such as registration and accreditation - was not totally acceptable.

The location of a regulatory system was discussed, as well as the need for the clear definition of responsibility of such a body. It also became apparent that different sections of the Western region of the United States have different attitudes and requirements in licensing procedures.

Licensing of family day care as it now exists, is dysfunctional and ineffective:

Class: *It is my contention that family day care has been a different game; but we have tried to jam it into an historic, traditional, regulatory means - instrumentally - that is just inappropriate.....*

A great amount of family day care is, in present day times, licensed after the fact of operation. Now this is contrary to the basic principle of licensing. None of you in this room will go to any doctor who got his license after he started to practice; and there is good reason for that. The idea of licensing is to reduce hazards - to protect users of the service in advance.

Now, in respect to medicine - pharmacy - we want that competence established by the State. This is not the situation in family day care. I would say it should be assumed in a democracy that we have child protective laws which protect against the mother's being neglectful or incompetent in caring for children. So when one decides that she needs out-of-home care or family day care and elects to select somebody - maybe someone she knows or someone in whom she has a great degree of confidence, who knows this procedure - she has a high level of competence herself. She can appraise that care; she doesn't require of the State the same way that you or I require of the State in respect to the doctor. She is in this to protect her interests. When you use licensing as we have used it - a highly formal process - then, it seems to me, we are moving toward a degree of statism that is unwarranted.

Dr. Class defined community regulation and gave an illustration of its use:

By community regulation is meant state programs, either under public or private office, which involve a formulation, appli-

cation or upgrading the standards of operation of a given service deemed by the legislature to have a public interest. The functional goals of community regulation are to insure minimal safeguards to the users and/or to upgrade the services of operation. Historically, the two primary regulatory instrumentalities that have developed the achievements toward goals are licensing and accreditation. Licensing or a less formal regulatory derivative, such as registration inspection, must almost by necessity be under public auspices. Accreditation may be under public or private authorization.

The field of the medical profession, or medical care, has moved forward in this country by having a minimal safeguarding operation in the form of the M.D. license. If I get this license from the State of California, I can practice nose, ear and throat today and obstetrics tomorrow, start psychiatry the third day, pediatrics the fourth, under the law of my M.D. license. But if I want my professional colleagues to refer cases to me, or if I want to establish myself in respect to a differential field, maybe I better have passed the National Board - such as the National Academy of Pediatrics - which is under voluntary auspices. They start where licensing ends; and they pipeline in the greater expertise that has been arrived at - not only by the profession, but by the users, by research, etc.

But it is voluntary. I still may make it without having passed the National Boards in Psychiatry; but in my opinion, after having studied regulatory administration for twenty years, I do not believe it would be possible to set up a public accreditation of psychiatry. So what I am saying is that licensing - or some derivative - and accreditation are the two formal regulatory programs.

The issue of consultation and licensing as a joint function was argued:

C.Nicholie: *I think a lot of family day care mothers do not even realize they can get a license. I'm sure there are many informal arrangements; for instance, my sister is really doing family day care but she doesn't know it. She is caring for other people's children in her home, but she had no idea that there is a license she should have had. I think this is a matter of public information.*

Peters: *I think there is a schizophrenic problem that we are dealing with here in this country. We have said, on one hand, that parents have the right to say what is done with their children; and it is still part of the common law - mystique - or whatever. Yet, on the other hand, we try to set up regulatory procedures that really don't take into account the parents and their decision-making right. I think this is where we absolutely become hung up on the hooks in the ceiling. I have argued for years that we should not have licensing and consultation mixed together - that licensing is a simple process, using brief guidelines* that should be well known, that could be printed - like the handbook you get from the Department of Motor Vehicles, which is very precise. Anybody who can read, or get somebody to translate for them, can find out.

But consultation is a big area, a very important part of the helping process, for everybody; not just family care, but center care; for parents who are puzzled about what to do with their own children in their own home. We need this kind of community consultation and we have for many years mixed these functions together. We have left the parents out; and we are reaping the rewards of confusion.

Rigney: The consultation and the inspection have been, at least at our agency, and I think in many agencies, together. The consultation takes precedence over the regulation inspection service.

Class: Dr. Peters' point is excellent - that we need a consultation service and we need consultation in respect to meeting many standards; but there is no place whatsoever for providing consultation in the licensing law. Most of the consultation you (Rigney) are doing - you are doing extra-legally and probably beyond the call of duty.

Welling: I would think it would depend on what your consultation is about; if it is on the subject of licensing or on program upgrading.

Rigney: In my experience, most people I have seen are not providing care at the time you come to see them. I do receive complaints, occasionally, and with the complaint then I do talk to the person about the need to be licensed and ask if they were aware of it. But the people I talk with initially have many questions about whether they want to go into day care; if it's appropriate for their family and exactly what is involved in it. So often my first meeting with them is to find out what they want to do and how to go about doing it.

Class: I would think the community would provide this consultation service; but the licensing department should not provide that consultation, surely. They should provide consultation on how you get a license, which is quite a different matter than deciding whether you want to go into family day care or whether you want to care for the elderly.

J.Nicholie: It makes more sense to have a consulting body that would work through, say, the local school system, which you could work with but which would not have any function in reporting you if you were doing something wrong - except, maybe, that you were abusing children. Then have certification come from, say, the Health Department; not that you are licensed for a day care center, but that your home is safe, so it wouldn't appear to be more than it actually is. Then, also, accreditation from a group of mothers. As a consultant, then, I could say to a person that is doing day care in her

> *home, 'Well, you really should have a certification of safety; it would be a good thing if you have accreditation by this association'. That would be more persuasive than a consultive kind of thing.*

Complaints were made about the location of licensing of family day care within the Welfare Department:

Gomez: *Couldn't we call the rose by another name - take the word 'welfare' out of the name - take licensing and child care out of the Social Welfare Department? I had a lot of trouble getting a back-up mother out of my friends because once you mentioned 'welfare' they'd freeze. I think just to give it a different image would loosen up some of the people.*

I lost my license because I couldn't get a back-up mother. I went to all my friends and as soon as they heard 'welfare' they didn't want to do it because they didn't want anyone coming into their home. I wasn't afraid of that because - why should I fear them? I'm not going to do anything against the law. Finally, the mother that I got, I had to give all kinds of assurances to - that no one would go into her home and that it would only be under extreme emergency that I would call on her. After I lost my license it took me nine months to get it back.

Class: *The administrative location of the program of regulation should be with a natural affiliate and with probably other community development services. It should definitely not be a poor relation to 'relief'. As long as social welfare has the responsibility for economic assistance, any other function will really be neglected or given short, limited attention.*

Dr. Class felt that group orientation meetings, prior to licensing, defeated the goals it was trying to accomplish:

> *Number one, I think it is bad pedagogy, bad teaching, bad precept and example. Any regulatory program concerned with family day care should operate on and want the highest level of individualization of the child as possible. I am still old fashioned enough to subscribe to the belief expressed by Edward Thorndyke. He was, I believe, one of the most important educational philosophers this century ever produced. He coined the phrase, 'You learn the reaction you make'. You don't learn about skating by not skating. You don't learn to ski by not skiing, in the final analysis. If you really want people who are going into this business to individualize children, I don't think you teach them about individualizing children by getting them down in a mass - particularly the first contact you have with them. I think it is bad teaching procedure.*
>
> *I would think that the least the State of California could do, in terms of high level, quality education for anybody that says they want to go into family day care, is to tell them, 'Come down to the office and we will give you thirty*

or fifty minutes on this question of what is involved in getting a license'.

The second thing is that it doesn't work and it is false economy, etc. We have done some research on this problem - quite a bit as a matter of fact. The most sensitive family day care mothers, the ones you want to get in, once they hear that pitch that you describe, they say, 'Little me do this?' and they bow out. The more aggressive individual may be prone, not necessarily, to make it a game. They play the game: 'I have this; they have the approval; tick!' So from this viewpoint of necessarily screening out, you don't necessarily trim out the wrong ones; you may screen out the good ones.

All of the family day care mothers present were licensed "because it's the law":

Peterson: *Why did you feel that a license was important to you?*

Greer: *I felt it was important because, rather than an individual doing an unlicensed thing, if there was any feedback, I would rather be licensed than unlicensed.*

Horvath: *You're not going to drive a car without a driver's license because the law says you need it.*

Gomez: *I'm in favor of licensing; not because I want to brag about my license, or put it up for everybody to see, but I want to be within the law and also for the parents' own peace of mind. I think you should be licensed and there should be basic laws. You and your home can add your own unique personality - your own unique touch to the work you do - but I do think there should be basic rules because we have the custody of human beings, their physical custody and their mental custody also; we exert an influence on other people's children, so I am in favor of licensing.*

Byrd: *I'm in favor of licensing; but, frankly, there are some things I don't understand about the welfare licensing.*

The policing function of licensing or registration became a point of controversy:

Mayes: *I have the feeling that you're saying, 'Throw out the licensing procedure totally'.*

Class: *But I am not saying, 'Throw out regulation'. Licensing is one form of regulation.*

Mayes: *Yes. I like the analogy that was done with cars before. I know cars are different than day care homes. Everybody does register their cars. When you sign that thing you say that you understand the rules of the road and that you feel your car is safe to operate on the road. Then the only thing that is ever used for is gross neglect; it is to protect the public in case your car isn't safe.*

Horvath: *But registering your car doesn't allow you to drive. No, you need a special license to put that car on the street.*

Mayes: *But it does say that you understand that you need a license to operate it, or whoever operates it needs a license; that you understand the rules of the road and that the car is safe to be operated and not a hazard to public safety. You're signing that when you sign your registration; but nobody is going to come and inspect your car every two weeks. You don't have to fear they're going to inspect your car; but you do have to think that you signed that, so you do keep your car in reasonable operating condition.*

Peterson: *I know that you come down the road and you see the cops and the barriers; you turn your car around and come up the next street because you know very well that your horn doesn't work; but you don't care because you don't need your horn anytime.*

Mayes: *You can get around anything if you want to get around it.*

Peterson: *That's a point you have to deal with if you're going to have licensing.....*

Mayes: *But if you do, in fact, harm somebody with your car, they can trace it and can get to you; if you do harm a child, some of these places can help you and work with you; but until you do, nobody is going to bug you.*

Clarification was necessary in terms of the differences and advantages of licensing and registration:

Emlen: *I want to raise the question of whether you think that the registration and declaration approach would reach a larger proportion of this target population than the licensing does. We're talking here about California and it seems like a different world to me.*

In Oregon, especially when you work the neighborhood side of the fence, licensing workers are as rare as ivory-billed woodpeckers; and people don't know about them. Licensing, itself, is something nobody really knows very much about, so licensing certainly hasn't reached very many people; and that may even be true in California. But what about this other approach? It seems to be one of the merits of the proposal that you're talking about - that it might reach more people than licensing does.

Lipsett: *What you are really doing with this certification policy is that you are getting rid of subjective values that the licensing person uses in interviewing clients, to see whether they really are, in fact, capable of giving love to young children. You're having a check registering which guarantees their safety. Right? You say this would get rid of the formal things - fire marshal, health things, etc. Really, what does it mean in terms of safety care? What do you put in this certification of all the complicated* things such as fire and health which we have now and are so different from community to community? That is the big hassle in registration. Whatever you do, how are you really going to make it simpler?

Welling: I think this is one of the major strengths in registration. Family day care has been sort of shoved into twenty-four hour licensing practices as the regulatory method, and that was not provided to carry out that function. I think the agencies - the welfare departments or health or whatever - have been very careful not to say abroad and aloud in all parts of the community that this was the law, because they couldn't handle the situation.

But with registration - opening up your community education and really saturating the community - 'this now is the process by which homes are registered'. It is the intent that certain standards are to be met and a publication will be given, stating the standards that are to be met. So I think the people we have sort of pushed underground, plus those who truly are operating without knowledge that they need to be licensed, will come to the front and say, 'Here we are; we want to do this'. Then you can proceed with your educational plan. But I think what Belle is saying about all these local ordinances and codes that get in the way is a major problem.

Class: Yes, but the point is - if you make this non-licensed I would think most of these local zoning things, particularly, would just drop off and melt like ice in the sunshine.

Lipsett: What makes you think this will be happening?

Class: My base judgment is that the zoning laws can only be upheld in respect to what you might call a business or a vocation. Okay, but we say this is not a business but a service; let's get down to the civil liberty aspects of this. I have the right to have kids in my own home. The person next door, from time immemorial - from Moses on - has the right; it is a natural right to take somebody else's child in your home and mother or parent him. Now that is a natural right. In the regulatory proposal that I'm putting forth, you transfer this natural right into a civil right - in a sense.

That you have to register, have to meet certain procedures - there can be a certain inspection to attain this - but the assumption that you start with is 'I have a right to do this'. But I go next door or one-half mile from here and say to you, 'In my opinion you're competent to carry out this parenting function' and I transfer my locus parentis; I transfer it to you, the locus parentis right that I have as a natural parent.

Welling: I'm not disagreeing with you, Norrie, in what you are saying in terms of civil rights. What I am suggesting is that it is not going to be that easy. The family day care operators are not going to run a case up through the Supreme Court as they neither have the money or the resources. It has to be a very clear educational function to change these ridiculous codes so they're relating to what our definition is of family day care. I think what the Office of Child Development is trying to do in the establishment for model day care is one way of getting at this. We've been meeting with some of the fire marshals in the State and talking about this. They are saying, 'Fine; help us redefine this'; but we have to use what we have in our books; but if we have a better definition, surely we can use it. So I think there has to be this tremendous educational process.

Class: I would have a civil right to do this. My registration program would do this. You know I have a natural right to participate in government, but I can't just go and vote anytime. I have to register to participate in a civil right. I'm saying that this registration program does this. I'm entitled to a review if you deny me.

But I think that the analogy shows what is wrong. What has happened in the South is they have put the equivalent of a license; they give you a poll test - can you read certain sections of the constitution? This is about what we have been doing to family day care parents - the licensing. Under my plan the family day care mothers have an advocate against the zoning thing; and it won't be up to the financially limited family day care mother; but it will be up to the department running the regulation to advocate, to plead the cause of the family day care mother in the highest court in the nation. So it is the advocacy factor I am aiming at in the final role.

J.Nicholie: Seems as though you're also having a policing factor with the regulatory agency - at least as I read it - in that the child care visitor, who also goes into the home, would also have some role in reporting the person who is not meeting standards.

Mugasis: When you talk about standards - what are those standards? We could be doing the same things as the poll people in the South are doing in making them read part of the constitution, if the standards, which we haven't said anything about yet, are like that - like maybe the standards now.

Standards and regulation were discussed: Should standards be rearranged? Who should establish them?

Peters: Let's talk a little about these questions of standards, because I also have very, very strong convictions about this. As many of you know, I've been very involved in this whole question of model code for day care licensing and, I think, what we have done in this country is typical of the way we approach many things - that it has been an 'add-on' process instead of an updating, a review and a community participation process. Gradually, over the years, we have removed community responsibility and replaced it with state responsibility and now we are trying to replace it with federal responsibility. It has gone farther away *from the people who are actually involved in the process. I don't care what it is - it is true of motor vehicles, true of medical licensing, and there are many problems.*

We have to get back to the community and get these people in a given community, whether it is a small section of a big city, or a rural area, or whatever; get them involved in the whole process of guidelines. I'd rather call them guidelines than standards, because standards - with a capital 'S' - is becoming another dirty word. We have to think what is involved; and we need to involve everybody that we can drag in by the coat tails.

But we have to get the kind of communication reestablished which we have lost somewhere along the line; and in the model code section that we were working on (Health and Sanitation), we have stressed the need to simplify, to throw out the anachronistic aspects of our present laws and regulations, to involve community people, to involve everybody from families, day care parents, physicians, nurses - anybody who is interested - business men, since this does involve them.

Prescott: *I'm convinced that the kinds of legal structures which we set up, in the long run really do make a difference. We keep on doing this piecemeal, adding a standard there and overlooking the fact that there is not staff to enforce it. It seems to me that if we are ever going to deal with child advocacy, we've got to stop behaving like this.*

One of the problems that family day care mothers in California find in licensing has to do with the requirement of an outside income. The notion of not being in a "business" if you care for children was brought up:

Byrd: *Someone used the word 'poor' and this does have a lot to do with homes in Pasadena not being licensed. In Pasadena if there is only one income in the home and that income comes from keeping children, you are almost out as far as getting licensed. The licensors feel if you just have an income from keeping children, the children can't truly get the love and attention that they might get if you had income from other sources. I know what they do; they really ground that application.*

Cager: *The idea in back of that situation is that you have to have at least some minimal amount of money to keep your home going. For instance, we licensed an AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) mother because she does have a kind of minimal salary - a money base to keep things going. Then to that, whatever fees she may collect from the users of the service can be added to supply the things such as food, etc.; but if the person has only very, very minimal income, then that person - even for her own family - is doing without a lot of things that would be necessary in the home; food, for instance.*

Prescott: *Daneska, if you are on welfare and want to keep children does the money which you receive for taking care of children (if you want to keep children in your home) get deducted from the amount you receive on welfare?*

Cager: *It gets deducted, as does income from any other source and in a similar manner; that would include that there would be certain allowable expenses for operation. The mother has one third of the total income not counted, as an incentive; then the balance of the net income after that is counted against the State's budget standard.*

Sale: *One of the interpretations from our licensing people that I have heard very loud and clear (and I think the staff will bear me out) is that women should not be in family day care if they are there to make money; that they must be doing this for altruistic reasons.*

Cager: *Well, you have all kinds of interpretations.*

Norris Class gave his view of the morning's discussion:

> *We've had a discussion and each of you will have to take from it what you want. But I would say that what I have taken from it is that there is semantic confusion. To say that, doesn't make it less - it really makes it more serious; because only on a semantic level is it possible for a communication to begin to arrive at goals or to take action. Now licensing was projected onto twenty-four hour foster care of family day care. I believe it was a horrible policy of the State. It developed vested interests, which have tended to perpetuate it and certain byproducts have accrued*
>
> *Licensing is concerned with attempting to make an objective evaluation of a person's technical competence that lends itself to objective review and evaluation, and in respect to earning a livelihood - possibly on a lifetime basis.*
>
> *Now I think it would serve children better if we set up a service in which we do, fundamentally, two things: We say to people, first, what we think standards are, if we can deal with that problem in communication and conceptualization; and we tell them whether we think they have met them. Then, secondly, we create other places - services - that make for better upgrading of the service. But we don't place that on the regulatory function, as such.*

SESSION IV

SESSION IV

The last session, held Saturday afternoon, was entitled The Future of Family Day Care. The purpose of this part of the Conference was to summarize, evaluate and develop some idea of "where do we go from here?"

Senator Mervyn Dymally began the session with some legislative wisdom:

> *I want to remind you I am basically a teacher. I have a general elementary credential and taught in the elementary schools for about six years - Los Angeles City School system - and I have a credential in special education and one in personnel. That is how I became involved in this and took an active interest. Last year, you know, the Department of Education set up a Task Force on Early Childhood Education. After I was elected I went over and paid my respects to George Miller and he said, 'What can I do for you?' I said, 'Nothing but one bill from you - child care'. So they worked last year and the chairman of the Task Force died suddenly of a heart attack and that went into limbo for a while; but I understand it is being revived; and it is hoped that coming out of this Task Force will be the structure of the new division or department that will handle everything to do with child care.*
>
> *One of the problems is that you run into a number of bureaucratic civil servants who do not want to give up their empire. If that is done I think Dr. Shield's hope for one agency to deal with child care and child development and early childhood education in California will be a reality; and if that's the case, I hope to chair the bill.*
>
> *You know last year we had a most repressive piece of legislation passed in the name of the Welfare Reform Act of 1971. There were two good things that happened to that Act: It was amended by two urban legislators, John Miller of Berkeley and Oakland, who got into it three million dollars for child care, and Bill Greeve who got in seven million dollars for work-related experiences. Last week the Senate and Assembly Ways and Means held meetings and we discovered, as of now, no money has been spent; the three million dollars are available.*
>
> *We have two problems, maybe three, involved. One is a philosophical difference between the Department of Social Welfare and the Department of Education. The Department of Social Welfare wants a baby sitting program: You bring the child, you dump it wherever and you take off; then you come back and pick the child up again. They don't want any involvement in education. It has to do with the conservative approach that you ought not to train the mind because you might make something out of it - just let it ruin itself; then they will become totally dependent on the welfare system. Then they have a target to oppose the rest of their political career. The Department of Education*

which has about as unique a program as any in the United States, wants to put some kind of educational components in the Act. That is one major problem.

The other one is that the counties have been reluctant to provide the 25% matching funds (we have a 75% to 25% formula in the State which will change in July to a 90% to 10% formula). In addition, the Director of the Department of Social Welfare wants to save the money to use it under the 90% - 10% formula. We have been advised by the legislative council that he cannot do that, because the fiscal year ends June 30th and that three million, if not used, has to go back to the General Fund; and there has to be new legislation for us to participate in the 90% - 10% formula. The chairman of the committee, Willie Brown, suggested to him that he was breaking law and order by not obeying the wishes of the legislature. So that's where we are; we have not had any type of leadership.

Now I asked the question of Wilson Riles, when he pointed out the fact that they had similar problems with local school districts in compensatory education, 'How did you break the deadlock?' He said it was a question of leadership - sitting down with the school board and saying, 'I don't care what your board says; I don't care what you think; this is the law and you have thirty days to implement it'. The Director of the Department of Social Welfare has not been providing that type of leadership, so we are at a standstill. About the only county which responded recently to some pressure was Alameda County, where the students at Berkeley took some of their student body funds and made a gift to the County of the 25%; and that generated millions of dollars.

So here we have in California about fifteen million dollars available for child care services and not one penny is being used. So I think one of the challenges you have here in this Conference, in addition to developing some kind of statewide agenda, is to look at your local counties and to begin to develop some pressure. Let me suggest to you that you cannot divorce the legislative and political processes from your programs. Your very survival depends on what we do or don't do in Sacramento. Child care education does not exist in a vacuum; it is a result of the kinds of legislation we pass and the kind of implementation that follows the passage of that legislation.

In the case of the Welfare Reform Act, it is zero. So one other thing: I think you have to give some serious thought as to how you get your local legislator to bring pressure to bear on the State to implement the law; this is not the creation of a new program; the law is on the books. How do you get your county supervisor, who finds it convenient during election to talk about welfare and welfare fraud, and about people who don't want to go to work - how do you get him to respond positively to the funds that are now available and not being used? That ought to be at sometime, if not today, *part of your agenda. Certainly you ought to be looking at what's going on in the legislature, because it is very important that you continue to exert the kinds of pressure that, say, the Welfare Rights people are doing now (a most admirable job).*

So I just want you to keep in mind that too often we get off into an academic bag and forget to realize that our very existence depends on what happens in Sacramento and what happens in Washington. A good example is that there was very little pressure being brought on the President before he vetoed that Child Care bill. It's kind of water under the bridge now, but we ought not let that happen again. So when new legislation is being passed, it seems to me, you should make your voice heard; and just don't tell me the little guy's voice doesn't count; it counts!

Why do you think I am here? Because I am concerned about your interests and what kind of support I can get from you for whatever legislation I may offer; or what pressure I could bring to bear in the Department as a result of your concern; the Department cannot say to me on Monday that nobody is interested in family care.

That is sort of a general overview of the situation, and I do hope you will continue this interest because, I think, this is becoming, probably, the number two business in the United States: Health care being number one; child care being number two. There is a growing awareness of the need for adequate child care services. Merci beaucoup.

Questions and comments followed Senator Dymally's provocative discussion:

(A) The educational versus the custodial approach -

Gomez: *I would like to ask about bringing education into the home. Now it is confusing to me what you mean by that. Do you mean formal education or do you let the child be creative? Provide the material and let the child decide what he wants to do or let the child develop his own talents? It is not clear to me what you mean. I thought that when children were little, you were supposed to supply the materials and to let them decide, at their own pace, what to do rather than to bring formal education into their lives. I think that by four they should be in kindergarten, but before that time, I'm confused.*

Dymally: *I'm not so sure that I am expert enough to answer that question except to say that my reference was not to the family day care but to the regular Children's Centers' program. Secondly, as far as education is concerned, I do not mean any formal structure, but I do know the Department of Social Welfare is opposed to any type of learning process taking place. They just want you to be a custodian of those kids.*

Cager: *I want to make a point. I am a County elployee of the Department of Social Welfare; there are two things I would like to clarify. One is that I don't think any county would dare to or want to provide day care without an educational component. I think particularly Los Angeles County is aware that if the educational component is not included in the day care then they are subject to a claim cut.*

Dymally: *That's the problem; that is part of the fight with the Director. Both the County Department of Welfare and the Department of Education are fighting with him. The other is that some counties have not put up their 25% kitty.*

Cager: *The second thing is that the State does have to put up 16 2/3% of that 25%.*

Dymally: *We've got the money.*

Cager: *So the County really has only 8 1/3% to put up.*

Dymally: *But some of them are not doing it; so it seems to me that you need to put pressure on the Board of Supervisors - wherever you are.*

(B) Awareness of the value of family day care and how to keep legislators better informed -

Lynch: *Is there an awareness among the state legislators of the value of family day care arrangements, or do they think in terms of center care?*

Dymally: *No, I consider myself maybe one of about a dozen knowledgeable people; but today was a learning experience for me. Legislators think of child care under the old system, you know, where you take children to school in the neighborhood, the quonset hut right next door. But I think there needs to be brought to the legislature's attention the difference and the new need for family day care and for making this service available. It is kind of a stepchild, so to speak.*

One of the ways you can do this is to develop a model legislative package on family day care. I think when that is done and you introduce those fifty bills in the fifty different legislatures that it will take another year; you will not get it the first year. It will be a learning process there. You will have public discussion on the legislation; it will be very controversial; but that is part of the legislative process. Many people, like myself, introduce bills, knowing full well that they will not pass in this year; sometimes it takes four or five years; but you keep the issue alive all the time.

Prescott: *I think that for a number of us your statement about education versus baby sitting rang a familiar bell; that has been a theme of this Conference throughout. I was* *wondering to what extent legislators are aware that Children's Centers do not provide care for children under two and that many of them, themselves, have felt that care for children under three was not really the thing that Children's Centers are best able to offer. Now I think everyone here appreciates the usefulness of Children's Centers and group care, so we want you to keep this in mind - our appreciation of it; but we also are very much feeling that legislators are not aware of the limitations of group programs, and we feel these are substantial enough to make it very important to have a diversity of options.*

Dymally: *One of the follow-up projects of this Conference ought to be a legislative task force; and you have all the brain power right here at this school to develop needed legislation. For instance, if you believe that the whole Children's Center program, as we know it now under the school district system, ought to include two year olds, you should draft such legislation and come up to Sacramento to testify. After its failure, you should ask the chairman of the committee to hold public hearings on the subject in various parts of the State; and then you come back again next year. Not only will you have educated the legislators but you will also have generated public support. I think this is the key.*

J.Nicholie: *But, Liz, that is not what you are suggesting - that two year olds be included in Children's Centers?*

Prescott: *Legally they can be included, but many directors of centers would agree that they are not able to offer what they would consider optimal care for children this young.*

Peters: *As presently constituted?*

Prescott: *Yes, as presently constituted.*

Dymally: *I do not want to give you the impression that I am an authority on this; all I am suggesting to you is that you have some problems and one way you could bring the problems to the attention of the legislature is by bill introduction. You have educated some people here, including myself; but one hundred and ninety of my colleagues probably don't know about this Conference today; and one of the ways you can educate them is through introducing legislation, in addition to your public relations and your conferences.*

Peters: *Let me just add a comment to what Senator Dymally has said which I think is very, very pertinent. When we were in Sacramento two or three weeks ago, several members of the California Children's Lobby appeared, as I told you, to give testimony before the Senate Committee on Health and Welfare, in regard to the need of child care. We were making some calls upon various Senators before the* *hearings began and there were two ladies whom we ran into in every office we entered. We learned, later, coming back from Sacramento to Los Angeles on the plane, that they were members of a very interesting group, the California Association of Parents for Children's Centers, which has been a viable organization for some thirty years. It had been in limbo but now it has come back into focus again in the surge of interest in developing the Children's Centers into a more responsive kind of organization.*

The thing that impressed me the most was that one of these ladies had been going back and forth to the legislature for thirteen years, making periodic calls on people whom she felt were key legislators - Senators and Assemblymen - who could help in this whole business of child care. She had done this at her own expense; I doubt if she was a very wealthy woman, but she felt this was an important personal investment. Too many of us sit back and let George do it. We don't think it is proper to be involved in politics because, you know, there may be some sort of things that we, idealistically, may not like to see happen; but I think we have to become politically minded.

(C) The need for a new structure for dealing with child care -

Bernstein: *I think it is awfully important to get child care in general away from the Welfare Department. This may not be an opinion that everybody shares; but I think, as some of our family day care mothers mentioned, that being attached to the Welfare Department lowers their image; and people don't think to go to the Welfare Department when they need child care.*

Also, I think when you attach funding of child care to welfare there is some kind of thinking that because it is for poor people it doesn't really have to be good. And it is clear that it is not only for poor people; there are a lot of middle class and professional women who need this care. We should have standards that would please the most exacting professional mother; and it should be for everybody. I think this new legislation you mentioned, in terms of a new agency to handle child care, might indeed be the answer.

Dymally: *These things just don't happen in the legislative process by themselves; somebody has to be the water dropping on the brick - constantly - to open up a hole.*

Welling: *Do you do this by, say, an organization or organizations coming together and saying, 'we want an Office of Child Development - or whatever you want to call it - for kids'; or do you do this by building something in one of the present organizations and then move it up?*

Dymally: *Keep in mind you have some statutory problems - some Federal statutory problems. You have the permission of the Federal Government of giving the money to Welfare. You have to have an ally. You're present ally - you've got to work with your friends - is the Department of Education. You would want a completely independent office - I want to start with that - and you have to find some umbrella for that. Incidentally, I think, legislatively, you would have a tough time starting a new office out there by itself. I don't think they're going to permit you to move up by yourself, so you have some limitations, so you go buy the half a loaf now.*

You structure, within a department, a completely independent organization, free of any board interference; and you write it into the statute. It's been done; it was done in Compensatory Education. So you could structure that and then, as it develops and grows, you could cover it with legislation to move it away from Education - away from Welfare - right in the center here.

But you have to start someplace and you create a whole new office or department or bureau concerned with nothing else but this. I'm just saying to you that what you want to do ultimately is good; but I think you have to work within the framework of possibilities now; and one possibility is under the Department of Education. Then, when you do your thing so well and so efficiently - then you move up.

Welling: *I think there is a movement going on in the country right now - and I don't know what the extent of it is - to establish offices of child development and for children's services in the office of the governors. Here in the West, Alaska and Idaho have done this, and Oregon has separated out their family and children's services into a separate division under the Human Resources umbrella.*

Senator Dymally left for another appointment and the discussion turned to thoughts for future plans. Elizabeth Prescott summarized the feelings of those present:

> *I was struck with the number of issues that came out in the short time we had together to talk. One of them was that Senator Dymally said he clearly had not known much about family day care, about its problems and its strengths; clearly, we have not been very helpful in informing him in the past.*
>
> *Then moving into this whole issue of how we want children's services to be regulated within the State; we got into this at one level in the morning and here we are back to it this afternoon, in terms of administration through departments. There are a number of people here who sort of balk at the idea of having children's services in the Department of Education. Certainly in the State there are a lot of reservations about having it in Social Welfare, and having it tied with the system's program.*

Here we obviously get into an issue that is going to have consequences for the future, not only of family day care and its regulation, but of all the children's services within the State; and I find myself sitting here thinking about all the things we really would need to be informed on, and the action we would want to take, if we are going to be at all effective in promoting any of our concerns.

Who speaks for family day care? And how can we improve its image and effectiveness?

Prescott: *This raises a question about visability of family day care. It has been pointed out that the Children's Center program owes its survival to the fact that parents organized and were able to marshal a great deal of political support. Look at the private group, pre-school group programs; they have their Pre-School Association which is very active in promoting their image. All the way across the board, the programs that have been noted have had people speaking for them. This raises the question of who speaks for family day care and what are the sort of things that we might want to speak to which would make it a more effective service than it is now?*

Bernstein: *It seems to me from what Senator Dymally has said, that if we expect to get anything out of this Conference, in terms of real action, the thing to do here, now, today, is to set up a continuing legislative task force which can put together all the ideas, the brainstorming which has come out of this Conference; and to begin to draft some legislation, not only at the State level but which can be fed to the people in Washington who have been here.*

Prescott: *It seems to me that this has several parts to it and one is this question: Why should anyone pay attention to family day care? What does it have to offer as a community service? I think this has come up repeatedly in this Conference in terms of the disparaging attitude toward it; and what we were saying about it on the Federal level - and what Senator Dymally was saying here in California - is that one of the things people need to know is: What is it good for?*

Then the second question is: What kinds of legislation and implementing services would we want to really push for and how does this fit into a total package of community services? Because this is only one of many of the caring services that will be available in a community.

Welling: *So much of our attention or direction has been in center care, where the money was, even though family day care was here with us and probably growing all the time. Now we are facing the issue of where will family day care fit into the system. From the projections I've heard, like HR I, 80 or 90% of the money that is projected for child care will go for family day care and the rest for center care.*

In order to improve the image of family day care, to develop it, to begin to look at what this does have to offer and is still offering to the parents and to the community, it is going to appear that we are favoring family day care because the extra effort needs to go into family day care. But efforts are still needed to go into other kinds of systems, too, and I think we have to keep this in mind; because it may look like we do favor family day care by the fact that we want to move it along faster than it's been moving along - to make it visible in the community.

Sale: There have been many meetings and conferences on day care but very, very seldom do you ever hear the mention of family day care; that is why this discussion may seem a little askew. I think we need to concentrate for a while on family day care in order to really explore what the possibilities and problems are.

This Conference was called 'Family Day Care West' for a very specific reason. I think the western family day care which we know is probably quite different from eastern family day care. I'm not sure, but the material that I have read from New York City indicates to me that it is remarkably different and I think, maybe, what we need to do is to explore on a broader level what the problems are on a nationwide basis. Perhaps our next step would be to think of a bigger conference as one of the things which we would consider for the future.

Lynch: All the time we are talking family day care, I think it really behooves us to assure those who are very 'center-oriented' that we are not saying that this ought to replace their endeavors or cut them out of whatever funds might be available; what we really are advocating is that there should be an alternative, which we've mentioned repeatedly. We have to do this; otherwise we are going to create a force against family day care - we don't need that problem.

Emlen: One way of making this clear is in pointing out the fact that, in essence, what we are doing is trying to develop some support systems for strengthening existing forces; and we won't wait, as we generally do for radical changes.

The fact is that people are going to be using family day care and that choices are being made, whether we like it or not. Family day care has some weaknesses but it has enough viability, it seems to me, to warrant our going in there and helping to strengthen it further.

But a lot is needed to make it work better and that requires funds. The information and referral process certainly is not something that comes free. Even though much of it will be done on an informal basis, still the structuring and supports for something like that cost money. Some of the educational components cost money..... We simply have to take a stand that family day care is already here; it is a form of care that is taking place.

Family day care meets the needs of working parents and children in a variety of ways. Caring for children who are ill or have special needs was again emphasized and questions were raised about this problem:

Donoghue: *Instead of just promoting family day care, what if the promotion was toward a system of care, pointing out how child care centers and family day care homes could be integrated? For example, a child could go to a familiar family day care home when he was too sick to go to the center; and children from family day care homes could go to centers for part days, rather than raising opposing camps here - if you go at it on this basis.*

Gomez: *I think what you are proposing is kind of unfair to family day care mothers. Why should we just take care of a sick child and special children?*

Donoghue: *No, not special children.*

Gomez: *And then send them back to the centers in four days?*

Donoghue: *Some of the day care homes could work that way and others would have alternate care.*

Gomez: *I think that group day care would be better equipped to have, maybe, a room or isolation place and a nurse, and they could do it because they are funded; but a sick child would certainly pose problems for a day care mother who has five or six children to take care of. To put a poor strange child in the home - sick - that becomes a traumatic experience for him.*

Donoghue: *I wasn't centralizing it quite like that. I was thinking somehow of finding one in which no small children were at home and who would be available for a specific child.*

Peters: *You are setting up an artificial system; I am bitterly opposed to that. I've been writing about this for ages and I am working on another article on health care delivery; because the kid who is sick needs to be in his familiar surroundings and you have to get away from this mystique that isolation is going to do anything at all.*

Where I worked in North Carolina we didn't isolate them; we tried it and it didn't work; the kids hated it; the staff hated it. You know it is ridiculous anyway because when a kid has symptons, whatever is causing the symptons is making the rounds. We studied what happened to them; we studied what happened to kids in other settings; also kids under the care of one of the most prestigious pediatricians in town, who was taking care of all the middle and upper class - the high income level people. There were no significant differences in the number of illnesses; and this was respiratory diseases, which is 90% of the problem - colds, coughs, even pneumonia in this young age group. They all had the bugs that were going *around in the community. Kids are taken to the supermarket, to the discount stores, down the street, to the movies, everywhere. We have to get over that; it's a plain silly notion.*

Prescott: *It seems to me that there is an underlying principle that ties together all of this discussion, which has to do with natural systems; and it seems to me that one thing that came through clearly in Art Emlen's paper - and I think it is implied in Norrie's thinking about regulation and, hopefully, came through to some extent in mine - is that a community is an ecological unit and it has a natural system that has been worked out by mutual regulation and needs of the people involved; and that we ought to take it seriously in thinking about what it is we're trying to do and how we want to get it to work better.*

Also, one of the things that this has been demonstrating for a long time is that you are going to get a diversity of options because you have a diversity of needs and a diversity of mothers. The fact is that all young children are going to get a certain number of respiratory diseases, and every mother knows there is no way to lick that - you just live with it. You start taking this experience seriously and think about what you are going to do about it - how you are going to make it work better - how you are going to make it official and build it into the system.

The discussion then centered around ways of supporting the natural systems of family day care in order to help them work better:

(A) Tell the story of family day care - make it visible -

Gomez: *We need public relations more to let people see and know what we are doing - what the systems are - the various ones.*

LaCrosse: *I see two very large major priorities in family day care. One is to let people know that it exists; what it is; and that it is not better than group care, or whatever, but just that it exists. The second thing is to say what goes on in family day care - mainly the sort of things I think Mrs. Gomez has been referring to - that education can take place in a variety of forms.*

One of the things I had written to Liz yesterday was that somebody really should write the Commonplace Book of Home Learning where one takes sort of the sophisticated professionals' ideas of Piaget, Elkind and Montesorri, etc., and translates those into the 'Montesorri Classrooms Held in the Kitchen' kind of thing. In other words - and I am quite serious about this - you make the leap between what is available in the home and what goes on in the home, to the more elegant theory that tends to make things acceptable and respectable.

I think that one of the reasons that group care has received such a note of respectability is that they can talk a very good game about the type of 'educational' components that go in and they are not talking about a different process; all they are doing is talking about different hardware that has been labeled 'educational' because somebody in Princeton, New Jersey, has published an article on child care.

This sort of thing is terribly unpopular, particularly within the groves of academe - making this translation. I was joking with somebody yesterday about the fact that you mention family day care and, zappo, the same nine faces appear in Denver, Boston and San Diego. We could sit and talk to ourselves until we are blue in the face and - to use a favorite phrase of mine - have that nice warm feeling in our tummies after a conference that something is happening. It won't happen, I think, until we translate.

I would much prefer to see us start bombarding Ladies Home Journal, Woman's Day, Family Circle and Redbook with articles about family day care; also, articles geared to the mothers about what you can do in your home; how education at home and education in school are basically, in many ways, exactly the same - you're just using different equipment. I would strongly opt for these being the first two priorities on which this Conference should take action, if this is to be an action Conference.

Kresh: I think what you need first is to have somebody really document the activities that take place - the learning experience that takes place - and translate that into Piaget terms, or into the learnings that we know about, and translate how these things are actually going on; I think that may be the first direction.

Greer: When a day care mother is called upon, as I was recently, to state what your philosophy is of educating children which you maintain at your place, I'm quite often so busy being involved with the children that I'm hard-pressed to get to the literature to read it. What you find on TV or radio is relatively little. So I stood back one day and said to myself that I am somewhere between Summerhill, Ginott and what a mother can stand in a day. A day care mother would be hard-pressed to say, 'Oh, yes, Piaget, Montessori, well, yes -- uh, uh --'

Prescott: I do a double take now when I hear somebody talk about the programs - our educational programs - as compared with baby sitting or family arrangement because we've looked at a lot of group day care. There are many things I don't know anything about, but I know something about what a day is like in group care; and a lot, a great deal of the day in group care (even in what is considered our good group care centers) is spent in waiting.

This is strikingly not true in homes. We've all been impressed time and again with the responsiveness of a home to where the child is; whereas, even in good centers, just the fact that you have a cognitive curriculum tends to remove it from the child's immediate experience, so that a child may, in fact, get rote learning about squares, circles and triangles - which seem to be one of the 'in' cognitive things this year. They can, in fact, demonstrate on a test that they can identify them and know the names of them; but I am not sure in terms of real intellectual power or problem-solving strategy that this is much of a contribution; it wasn't at a point of a child's experience of getting stuck where he had to come up with some kind of a solution.

Greer: How can we as day care mothers pick out a significant thing? The story I told about the ants yesterday was one thing. I have another that I label 'left handed learning'. If we could get these experiences compiled and maybe complemented through photography, and then get this out to the public.....

I was building a swing up in a tree with a rope and I made loops in the rope so that the kids - maybe not now but one of these days - by using these loops, either by hand or by feet, are going to make it up into that tree; and these three year-olds want up into that tree very badly. (Put a flat base of board down at the base to begin, so if you can't climb you can at least swing.) Someone had to hook that rope up in that tree and that somebody had to be me. I shinnied up the rope, got up there and the kids began to see me. Okay, I used this situation to my advantage. I said, 'Now I'm not, but what happens if Mommy is trapped up in this tree? What are you going to do?'

"We're going to run to Mr. Slaughter and tell him Mommy's in the tree.' 'As long as you're pretending, pretend Mr. Slaughter is not at home. What are you going to do?' 'We'll go to the telephone.' 'What are you going to do when you get to the telephone?' 'Well, Mommy's up a tree.' 'Who is Mommy?' Then there was this big discussion as to who was Mommy and who was Suzanne - but we'll talk about that later. 'Well we're going to get the Fire Department trucks to come after you.' 'How are you going to get the fire trucks?' 'We're going to tell the operator.' 'You're at the telephone - how are you going to do it?' 'Dial zero - that is the simplest thing to do - just dial the zero and say that Mommy Suzanne, who lives at 1616 Belvedere, is up the tree.'

How different it would have been if I had tried to drill this kind of thing into them; but you have to be able to pick up when they are partially projected into a reasonably scary situation to transfer vital information.

Prescott: Any of you who have watched the process of teaching children to say their names and addresses in a group program, appreciate, I think, the difference between that experience and the layers of learning in this experience.

Milich: We have a great advantage in the fact students who are able to pick these things up put them in their logs, and I have pulled out of these some very significant learning experiences. Perhaps you could label this 'Piaget'; we prefer not to.

(B) Problems of research in different settings and the need for research:

Emlen: *I am going back to a research question. We've talked in terms of follow up studies and other kinds of things - particularly where you are looking at the outcome on children; and it may be that some of these different kinds of settings (group care, in home care, family day care, etc.) do provide different kinds of socialization experiences which require different kinds of measures. Perhaps we simply may not have come up with the measures that are sensitive to the differences that are unique to that kind of setting. That is why it is so difficult to make comparisons across settings, even though there may be more differences within settings.*

I think one of the reasons why the old maternal employment studies didn't show any differences were, not only because they didn't control for the inputs into the situation, but also because the outcome measures were brought out of measures that would be sensitive across the board - maybe to aspects of personality and development that are in general but may not capture some of the uniqueness that may come out of particular types of socialization experiences. Still it is not a question of which is better, but there may be some real differences.

Lipsett: *If we have to wait to get all of this material to be fed into the machines in order to get data for family day care, we are going to wait a long time for money.*

Kresh: *Well I guess, maybe, that is what Art was driving at too; and I was sitting here listening earlier and what I heard was a lot of concern for programs and service and what you're going to do and legislation; but again that ultimately research, hopefully, will provide some answers.*

One of the hardest questions in the world - and maybe we can't measure these things because we haven't defined them - is what kind of human beings are we trying to develop? Maybe if we had some definition of that and we knew what variables to look at .... but the minute we say how do they function? what are they like? - then where do we go from there? Is it positive? Is it negative? What does it really mean in terms of the kinds of human beings we're trying to produce? What are these breeds of cats we're trying to bring up?

Villegas: *I'm really disappointed that we, as people, have to be so scientific - that we need to have data in order to move - in order to answer the questions. You know we're not. We should be people of action. Why do we always lack confidence in ourselves? we always have to prove things; things are happening; we can't wait for studies to be made; and even if studies are made....*

Emlen: *May I point out that nothing would have happened in family day care if it hadn't been studied. What little advance that has been made is a by-product of data and research.*

(C) How do we organize to help the family day care system?

Lipsett: *There are so many other people that have the same thoughts in their minds, up and down the State. There are so many people that would* like to have the same kind of thing. If there could be some way we could reach out to other people. We could ask the day care parents to go back to their groups; people like us, in agencies, could go back and get all the people we know - because there are a lot of us; then we could have some kind of thing to get together as a group.

Cager: You have the Federation's meetings here; could some representatives of this group perhaps meet with the Federation (The Family Day Care Federation) at one time or another and sort of get them on board and to sort of let them know what you're planning?

LaCrosse: One option that occurs to me - is there any way we can either build into a grant for next year, or think about seriously for this year, having what I would call a family day care clearing house in the sense that one has resource people. Instead of trying to bring everybody in the State of California together, that where people that are interested in family day care - say in Oakland area or the San Diego area, or an x, y or z area - can be made available to people in that area who wish to further talk about family day care. I think the context is almost like that of a speakers' bureau - only having a much more broadly based idea than just a speakers' bureau - where people who are interested in family day care could get in touch with those within a twenty mile radius who can come and talk.

Emlen: A national news letter might be useful, too.

Mayes: I would also wonder about some kind of organized effort to feed into these other day care efforts; there are lots of meetings going on about day care everywhere, and rarely is family day care mentioned. Perhaps some organized effort to get together with the California Association for Early Childhood Education - they are having conferences on day care - might be possible; and not only get on the agenda and go to the meetings, but say, 'Hey, I hear you're having a conference - sounds exciting; may we have our input?'

Emlen: I think it would also be useful to elicit more information from the various Federal agencies that are involved - not only the OCD but OEO. One of the peculiar developments is that OEO has suddenly put family day care as top priority for the next year in some of their research and plans. In some ways there is a lot more activity going on than we know about; there is a lot more need for cross fertilization and ideas, and research about it.

Welling: May I suggest another department - the Department of Labor with all the manpower training programs? They are going to play a major role in what happens in child care in the United States.

Horvath: From what I've heard everybody say, there are associations, federations, or whatever, for day care mothers all over the State of California. What are the chances of sometime helping us communicate with each other? There is obviously a lot more we can do; we could probably a lot more effectively pool our ideas; and sometimes more heads help, and maybe you people could help us along these lines. I mean that we make ourselves known as best we can, but not very well.

We're not informed, either, as to what's happening. As a matter of fact, someone just said there was something going on at Berkeley; and here we are; sometimes it is very hard to know what is happening.

La Crosse: *It occurred to me, as I was talking earlier about educating the public about family day care, that I was falling into that good old professional trap that there is 'no-one-quite-as-good-as-me-to-do-the-job' type of thing; I wonder if, maybe, the best thing that might come out of this conference would be for some attempts to be made toward information sharing amongst family day care groups. It wouldn't be single mothers but clusters of mothers, here and there, who have banded together - to let them talk to one another; because they, rather than I or the type I represent, are going to be much more effective spokesmen for what happens in family day care. And you know, 'Hell hath ....' and I wonder, then, if an even better effort than, say, the clearing house concept might be a sort of inter-family day care mothers' group communication thing.*

Nye: *It sounds like an exchange newsletter to me.*

La Crosse: *Yes, an exchange where you are talking about: one, legislation; two, what's going on; and three, that maybe some of the things that are actually happening in homes which people have found really work could be shared. So it has a multi-level usage really - or appeal.*

Byrd: *I feel like our users should be part of our conferences and meetings, too, because so many times they place their children in our homes and they don't know what's going on. A friend of theirs had a child there and she says it is a good place and it is the best thing to do, so they place their child there. If they are part of us, they would be coming in with their ideas; and a lot of mothers would like to know what's going on and be part of the program that their children take part in.*

Welling: *I just want to make mention that the models that are being developed, and that package, does include a piece of model legislation. I just just want to alert you that there is a plan going on for state meetings on these models. Some of you have seen them and some have not - and more of you should have seen them - but we have not been able to get a supply into this region. That plane just can't get over the Rocky Mountains!*

I think if the State really starts things, it is very appropriate at that time to use the State meeting to really bring up a lot of the issues that happen just in relation to family day care; and to make certain those models reflect the concern that has been expressed here; then take it from there in terms of legislation or whatever the State may recommend. This is going to be up to the State and to State people and not the general agencies.

Elizabeth Prescott closed the conference:

I think one of the suggestions that seemed to be most feasible for picking up on all of these loose ends was that we not try to do anything formal today; but that we all come up for air and that we will receive the report of the conference and, hopefully, by then will have a clear idea of how we can pick up and get in

> *touch with each other. I think it is rather difficult for all of us, at this point, to be crystal clear about what are the most useful things to pick up on how is the most useful way to do it.*

It was decided that the following people would serve as contacts for future communication, should it be necessary, on a regional basis:

Ivan Nye - Washington

Betty Donoghue - Oregon

Belle Lipsett - Northern California

June Sale - Southern California